FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 227 25 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Delegate Addresses Chemical Weapons Conference AA 1
Petrovskiy Details Comprehensive Security Plan AA 2
Comments on Debate [Lobachenko] AA 2
NATO Helping U.S. Depart From Reykjavik Path [Chernyshev] AA 3
Commentary Cites Gen Rogers on 'Aggression' [Mnatsakanov] AA 4

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

PRAVDA Assesses Work of CSCE Follow-Up Forum [24 Nov] CC 1
'International Situation -- Questions and Answers' [Patsyuk, Moseyev, Bogdanovich, Pravdin] CC 4

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Bogachev Urges U.S. To Discuss Weapons Ban A 1
Further Reportage of Iran Arms Sale Controversy A 2
Kornilov Comments A 2
Seyful-Mulyukov Criticism A 3
Whitehall Condemns Sales A 5
Crist To 'Hush Up Scandal' [Yefremov] A 5
Surguchev on U.S. Plan To Use European Rockets A 6

CHINA

PRC Health Workers Delegation Visits Moscow B 1
Minsk Visit B 1
Industrial, Trade Exhibit Scheduled for Beijing B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

PRAVDA Rebuts Japanese Government View of SDI [Ovchinnikov, 19 Nov] C 1

SOUTH ASIA

Reportage of Gorbachev Visit to India Continues D 1
Interview With Journalists [PRAVDA 24 Nov] D 1
Stops Over in Tashkent D 11
Leaves for Delhi D 11
Arrives in Delhi [Ilyashenko] D 11
Further on Arrival [Ilyashenko] D 13
Gorbachev Arrival Statement D 13

Gandhi Welcoming Speech D 15
Meeting in Indian Parliament D 15

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

TASS Reports Situation 'Tense' in Philippines E 1
Andrianov Commentary E 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Visit of Netherlands' Leader G 1
Further on Talks With Ryzhkov [PRAVDA 22 Nov] G 1
Ryzhkov Kremlin Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 22 Nov] G 2
Lubbers' Reply to Hosts [PRAVDA 22 Nov] G 4
Urges Jewish Emigration [Hilversum] G 7
'Frank' Talks With Gorbachev [PRAVDA 23 Nov] G 7
Meets Ryzhkov, Protocol Signed [IZVESTIYA 23 Nov] G 9

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Reports Arrival of Benin's Kerekou [22 Nov] J 1
Received by Gorbachev [PRAVDA 23 Nov] J 1
Arrives in Azerbaijan 22 Nov J 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Reports 20 November Politburo Session [22 Nov] R 1
Central Committee Criticizes Plan Fulfillment R 3
Looks at Construction Progress R 3
Official Describes State Acceptance Service [Isayev] R 4
Parliamentary Group Holds 19 Nov Meeting R 6
Meslennikov on Plan, Budget at Supreme Soviet [IZVESTIYA 19 Nov] R 6
Ryabev Appointed Machine Building Minister R 14
Yeltsin Addresses Subway Workers Conference R 15
Official Dismissed Over Winter Preparations R 15

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

TASS Notes Grain Yield Totals 210 Million Tons T 1
Paper Assesses Role of Personal Subsidiary Plots [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 Nov] T 1
Agricultural Developments for 19-22 Nov Reported T 3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

PRAVDA Notes Cosmos Satellite Flight Parameters [22 Nov] U 1
TASS Notes Launch of Cosmos-1802 25 Nov U 1
New Space Station Technology Introduced U 1
Pacific Booster Rocket Tests Completed U 2

DELEGATE ADDRESSES CHEMICAL WEAPON CONFERENCE

LD242101 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Geneva November 24 TASS -- Another round of multilateral talks on banning chemical weapons began here today within the framework of the disarmament conference. The objective of the talks is to work out a convention that would ban and abolish this extremely dangerous type of weapon of mass annihilation. In the opinion of many delegates, the talks are entering their closing stage. This is largely due to a number of major initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union during 1986.

Viktor Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation, addressing the opening of the round presented the latest proposals on measures to prevent the production of chemical weapons in the commercial industry. This was one of the principal issues on which the sides reached no agreement so far.

The Soviet proposals provide for the determination of definite regimes of restrictions and control with regard to the four categories of chemicals the production of which for purposes permitted by the future convention deserves special attention.

The first category includes the most dangerous extra-toxic lethal chemicals possessing a complex of properties intrinsic in warfare agents and substances making up key components of binary chemical systems.

Each participating state will be able to produce them in the volume limited to one ton a year at one specialized facility given permanent international control.

The second category includes extra-toxic lethal chemicals which are not warfare agents. Their production could be carried out without qualitative restrictions in the conditions of systematic on-site inspections.

It is proposed to include in the third category so-called key precursors of extra-toxic lethal chemicals, that is substances involved in a one-stage chemical process of producing end toxins. The Soviet proposals provide for permanent control in respect to facilities producing such precursors in considerable amounts.

Finally, the fourth category comprises substances which are widely used for peaceful purposes but can also be used for purposes of chemical weapons. Their production could be controlled by way of on-site inspections at request. The Soviet proposals also provide for measures to prevent the use of multi-purpose production facilities, laboratories, scientific research institutions and test sites for the development of chemical weapons.

The head of the Soviet delegation stressed the need for the adoption of legislative, administrative and other measures which would preclude circumvention of the ban on the production and development of chemical weapons through transnational corporations.

Circles at the conference note the business-like, concrete character of the Soviet proposals. Many delegations draw attention to the strictness of the Soviet-proposed measures for international control which make it possible to guarantee compliance with provisions of the future convention by all its participants. At the same time, it is widely recognized that the Soviet proposals are characterized by compromise and take into account the interests of other nations.

The Geneva talks will continue until December 17.

PETROVSKIY DETAILS COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY PLAN

LD202031 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Text] New York November 20 TASS -- The delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly today expounded its views on the issue of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Submitting this issue to the session for consideration, the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, are guided by a serious apprehension over the destiny of peace, by the concern for the future of nations, V.F. Petrovskiy, a deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., told the first committee.

The proposal is aimed at establishing in practice a world free from the policy of strength and from the threat of nuclear self-destruction, a just and democratic world where there will be neither a nuclear nor a military space club of some chosen nations. A humane world where the right of every human being to life will be guaranteed, where nations will be able to choose freely their own independent road of development.

A world characterized by law and order and morality, where a free and safe development of every nation will become the condition for a free and safe development and prosperity of the entire international community.

The mainstay of the entire edifice of security should be direct guarantees that both nuclear and conventional wars will be outlawed. The elimination of the material base for waging wars, disarmament that would physically rule out the possibility of use of armed strength are acquiring decisive importance.

A dependable security for all calls for the elimination of the existing arms arsenals on earth and for barring arms from space. A dependable security is impossible if the threat of war emanating from earth will be supplemented or replaced by a threat from space.

Comments on Debate

LD242313 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, V. Lobachenko report]

[Text] The 41st session of the UN General Assembly is continuing at UN Headquarters in New York.

[Lobachenko] Attention of its participants is drawn to the discussion at the session's first committee of the issue of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security. [Video shows panning shot of the audience, dwelling on Soviet, Ukrainian and Belorussian positions, among others] This issue has been included in the agenda at the suggestion of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs, spoke at the session of the first committee. He stressed that the socialist countries, which have put forward the initiative, are guided by their serious alarm over the destiny of the world and their concern about the future of the nations. [Video cuts to an interview room, camera shows close up of Petrovskiy]

[Petrovskiy] Discussion of the issue of setting up an all-embracing system of international peace and security, which has just been launched at the First Political Committee following the initiative of the socialist countries, causes a great deal of profound interest on the part of a wide variety of countries represented at the General Assembly session. I would like to say that it leaves no one indifferent. They are talking now, arguing, and that can be seen as recognition of the significance of this issue, because what is involved is implementing new political thinking into the political thought and practice of international relations. What is involved is creating a guarantee of security in all spheres of international relations, a guarantee that would secure the future and enable mankind to survive in our nuclear and space age.

NATO HELPING U.S. DEPART FROM REYKJAVIK PATH

LD211828 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

At the recent session of the NATO council in Brussels at the level of ambassadors -- permanent representatives, it was stated that the possibility of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe and of all ballistic missiles 'gives rise to deep concern' among political and military quarters of the USA's NATO allies.

This fact, as well as speeches by some leading figures of Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France, indicate that the prospects for the deliverance of Europe and of the entire world from nuclear weapons, the possibility of which was shown by the meeting in Reykjavik, horrified some people in West European capitals.

In London, Bonn, and Paris they began to assert that nuclear weapons were almost a boon, that there was no alternative to the nuclear strategic, and that the elimination of U.S. nuclear arms in Europe would tell on the political and security ties between the United States and Western Europe, and so on and so forth.

'New terms' or, putting it in a simpler way, obstacles to the process of disarmament, are being thought up. Attempts are being made to tie the nuclear arms issues up tightly with chemical and conventional arms.

All those distracting manoeuvres are designed to help the U.S. Administration to cover up its departure from the results achieved in Reykjavik, to confuse the public, and to damp the peoples' enthusiasm for peace and detente.

At the same time, London and Paris seek to uphold their imaginary privileges to nuclear status. Fearing lest the issue of British and French nuclear forces should arise in the near future, they are stating with great haste that the plans for the upgrading and building up of their nuclear forces remain unchanged.

Quite recently officials in those capitals were singing the praises of 'zero option' for Europe, voicing 'righteous indignation' over the Soviet demand for taking into account British and French nuclear arms, and were virtually giving consent to the elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe, accepting NATO's 'two-track' decision.

Now that, due to the Soviet initiatives, real opportunities have come about for setting the beginning to nuclear disarmament, officials in those capitals are confirming that they had bluffed before and engaged in demagogery, and are showing actually that it is not at all European peoples' security that is the object of their concern.

The aims of such policy were frankly revealed by General Bernard Rogers, supreme commander of NATO Forces in Europe, who stated that the bloc should continue to maintain a first nuclear strike capability. Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, according to "DER SPIEGEL" magazine, has 'reassured' the West European nuclear arms advocates by saying that they might have no doubt that the words being uttered in Washington about disarmament would remain just mere words.

COMMENTARY CITES GEN ROGERS ON 'AGGRESSION'

LD192324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Commentary by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Sessions of the so-called North Atlantic Assembly have just ended in Istanbul. They were held as a kind of prologue for the NATO winter session set for December. And to ensure that everything is peace and harmony at the session, General Rogers, the supreme NATO allied commander, Europe, made a speech in Istanbul which was obviously something in the way of a set of directives. What did the American general say? First: The accord reached at the Soviet-American talks in Reykjavik on the reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals is just a distant dream, and so the United States and its allies have no option but to continue building up these arsenals. Second: The elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons would leave Europe defenseless in the face of Soviet aggression, and so NATO categorically objects to this accord which was also reached in Reykjavik. Third: We, declared General Rogres, see a threat of aggression with conventional and chemical weapons emanating from the Soviet Union, and so on our part we energetically have to develop and intensify these armaments.

It must be said that on this occasion the American general was not speaking on behalf of the Pentagon. He would not have cast aside all restraint in this way if he had not been counting on the favorable consideration and support of London, Paris and Bonn, where the alarm bells are ringing at the prospect of a nuclear-free Europe and of a nuclear-free world. Should Western Europe end up without its nuclear shield, so the theory goes, it will immediately fall victim to the overwhelming superiority of the conventional armaments of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries.

It is scarcely worth rebutting this many-times rebutted theory. First, even according to the estimates of Western specialists there is a rough equilibrium between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, both in conventional armed forces and armaments. Second, the alliance of socialist states has on numerous occasions proposed that the reducyion of these forces be embarked upon on a parity basis. At the start of the year the Warsaw Pact states called on the other side to start talks on this issue without delay and they proposed a specific plan for the reduction of armed forces and armaments in the continent. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, the USSR has long been advocating the earliest, complete destruction of these weapons everywhere and the elimination of the very industrial basis for manufacturing them. The draft of the appropriate agreement was submitted by the Soviet Union at the Geneva disarmament conference.

In the West all these proposals are stubbornly being ignnored and chatter continues to be heard at the same time about the overwhelming superiority of the Russians. And on the quiet, in Washington and Paris, for instance, decisions have been adopted in the last few days to manufacture a fresh generation of chemical weapons. What are they driving at? Reykjavik showed that a world without weapons and wars is not simply a dream. It can and must become a reality. And a heavy burden of responsibility is assumed by those who attempt to blot out this reality.

PRAVDA ASSESSES WORK OF CSCE FOLLOW-UP FORUM

PM241715 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 86 First Edition p 6

[Special correspondents B., Dubrovin and V. Mikhaylov dispatch: "Vienna-86: The Difficult Path to Reason" -- passages within slantlines printed in boldface]

[Text] Vienna-Moscow -- /One experiences particular emotion through contacts with the living past in Vienna. This is when coming across the distinctive architectural monuments in the old city. Here one can also read numerous pages of the history of the most protracted battle of our century -- the battle for outlawing war from the life of earth's inhabitants. One can compute, compare, and understand the importance of the current Vienna meeting of representatives from CSCE member states./

It was here, in 1952, that one of us had the opportunity to attend the congress in defense of peace and to hear the appeal by the great scientist and citizen Frederic Joliot-Curie "to put an end to collective insanity (the 'cold war' and the arms race) which, unless it is halted, could make a return to reason very difficult."

The "cold war" had been raging for almost 2 decades then [sentence as published]. But the new outbreak of insanity in the eighties has not been able to destroy the foundations of peaceful cohabitation in Europe, which were laid in the preceding decade. And the building of the common European home according to the plan approved in Helsinki in 1975 by 33 European states, the United States, and Canada, is going on. /The first weeks of the Vienna meeting reinforce the hope that it will elaborate solutions capable of offering Europe greater security and enhancing the level of cooperation in all spheres.

Of course, the all-European construction project is not proceeding in isolation. It is not detached from the outside world. Lines of forces with opposite signs -- either of confrontation or of cooperation -- run through the European continent's political life. This is why here, at the first East-West meeting since Reykjavik, there is exceptional interest in whether the turn toward a move in the direction of a nuclear-free world and, consequently, a nuclear-free Europe, which became noticeable there, could become a reality. Naturally, attention at the Vienna meeting focused on the speeches by the participants in the Reykjavik talks -- USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State G. Shultz.

The truthful analysis of what happened in Reykjavik, contained in the Soviet speech, the convincing proof of the importance of continuing the struggle to consolidate the historic frontiers reached there along the path toward nuclear disarmament, and the confirmation of the USSR leadership's resolve not to deviate from its aim of radical reduction and subsequent liquidation within a 10-year period of all types of strategic offensive weapons in combination with the prevention of an arms race in space -- all this made a profound impression on the representatives of the 35 states who had assembled in the Hofburg Palace.

/The truth about Reykjavik was successfully brought to the notice of participants in the all-European forum in Vienna. And this is exceptionally important both now and for the future./

The speech by the U.S. secretary of state sounded in sharp discord not only with the Soviet, but also with most of the other statements in the Hofburg. It contained no new ideas, and only went to confirm Washington's commitment to the senseless and dangerous "Star Wars" program. As far as the European participants in the Vienna meeting were concerned, this meant that the White House intends to continue blocking earth's liberation from nuclear weapons.

It proved impossible, however, to wipe off in Vienna the deep impression left by Reykjavik. "Now no one can say any more that the liquidation of nuclear arms is a hopeless utopia," Hungary's Foreign Minister P. Varkonyi noted in his speeck, "or that the pursuit of this goal is tantamount to tilting against windmills." "The Reykjavik meeting," Sweden's Foreign Minister S. Andersson declared, "emphasized even more strongly the importance of the all-European process." "Let us take advantage of the opportunities offered by the favorable international situation," Finland's Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen appealed to the participants in the Vienna meeting, "to achieve progress at this forum." /The weight and influence of all states in the continent must be put in the balance in favor of a nuclear-free world./

Neither any of the European countries, nor Canada said a word in support of the U.S. secretary of state's statement that "the West needs a vigorous SDI program..." On the contrary, in the ministers' speeches there were repeated demands for careful observance of agreements limiting the arms race. Only the French delegation's words sounded sweet to the Pentagon, words to the effect that "mankind has no alternative to nuclear deterrence" and the "total destruction of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe... would be dangerous for the continent." Although one can also hear similar things from London and Bonn at the moment, here, in Vienna, the British minister chose to avoid the topic. But H.-D Genscher, leader of the FRG foreign policy department, said that for Europeans the elimination of medium-range missiles "remains in the foreground." "Nothing that was gained in Reykjavik," he said, "must be lost."

The main hall fo the Hofburg Palace has been for a long time a place of great and difficult work for Europe's benefit. The sheen of the dance floor is concealed by a dark red carpet. The rows of tables for the delegations are arranged in strict alphabetical order, like the flags in front of the entrance to the palace and in the hall. And the representatives of all 35 countries take turns in chairing the forum. /Equality in details and in substance is a token of the increasing democratism in international relations. It is dictated by equal responsibility for and commitment to the shaping of a life without fear of war, to progress, and prosperity./

But not everyone likes the idea, let alone the practice of equality. Especially those who would rule the world and are trying to conduct a policy of neoglobalism. The U.S. secretary of state plainly stated in the Hofburg: We cannot accept others' claims to the right to so-called 'equal security'..." The Pentagon is worried lest Europe move on to practical arms limitation following the success at the Stockholm conference in elaborating confidence-building measures. It fears a chain reaction. Indeed, in the event of the U.S. blockade against disarmament issues being breached here, it would be far more difficult to keep to an arms race course. "The neutral and nonaligned countries which gave assistance in reaching compromise accords in Stockholm," according to C. Weinberger, "will have no place at all at the negotiating table when it is a matter of limiting conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals." U.S. delegation head W. Zimmerman, on leaving for Vienna, was fairly frank in his explanation of the reasons for this Pentagon guideline: "How can discipline be maintained in NATO ranks at a forum of 35 states!"

From the start of the forum in the Hofburg there was a discernible intention to use another method as well to prevent Europe from switching to lowering the level of military confrontation. From what constitutes the organic unity of the basic spheres of all-Eruopean cooperation -- military, political, economic, and humanitarian -- the latter element has been separated. Its significance has been exaggerated to the point where it obscures all the rest. It would be different if humanitarian issues were being emphasized in order to actually improve cooperation in that area. [paragraph continues]

But not so, the main purpose is to provoke confrontation to prevent viewpoints from coming closer together. It follows the recipe of the bad old days: The "values" of bourgeois society are declared to be universal and the countries which have long rejected them and have shaped a far more humane and just way of life are anathematized. Of course, the representatives of the United States and certain NATO countries, who tried to get such a debate going in the beginning, are very well aware that it is futile to try to impose one's own ideological views on others. But they are not doing it for that purpose. Their aim is to lead the discussion of humanitarian problems into a blind alley straight away and then, on the pretext that there is an "imbalance" in the all-European process, block movement in all other directions. And above all prevent the transition to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. And if there is no progress in this sphere there will be a "plausible" argument for not commencing to rid the continent of nuclear weapons. Was it not to create evidence of humanitarian problems "lagging behind" in the overall equation that the U.S. side rejected the final document of the Bern experts' conference which had been approved by all the European participants, on contacts between people and prevented the Ottawa human rights conference from being successful?

However, at the Vienna meeting those schemes were immediately undermined. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were open to the discussion of all questions affecting the Final Act. As far as they are concerned -- and this was immediately shown in Vienna -- there are no "prohibited" or "inconvenient" themes, no taboos. Confirmation of this stance was provided by the Soviet side's proposal to hold in Moscow a representative conference of participants in the all-European conference and to approach the whole range of humanitarian cooperation with new historic criteria. This initiative has already received wide support.

In many speeches at the Vienna forum the idea could be perceived that only constructive dialogue can lead to major decisions in Europe's favor. "Our work must be in earnest, it must not be characterized by polemics," Italian Foreign Minister G. Andreotti noted. "Our task is to achieve unity while ensuring the full respect of the political, economic, and social regimes of the continent's countries and preserving the European peoples' cultural and national appearance."

The discussion of the main areas of European cooperation is becoming richer and more meaningful. Among most of its participants an inner confidence has appeared in the durability of the general continental system founded in Helsinki. And the participants in the Vienna are boldly embarking on constructive criticism. For example, many speeches voiced dissatisfaction at the level of economic ties. It clearly lags behind the potential being created by scientific and technical progress. Some, mainly from the NATO countries, put this down to restricted information and obstacles to trips by business people. Others looked deeper. The discriminatory prohibited lists of goods for export foisted on Western Europe from across the ocean, the imposition of boycott and embargo, and other artificial barriers are flagrant breaches of the Final Act's provisions. Even now they are threatening to become the main obstacle to the strengthening of the continent's independence. CSSR Foreign Minister B. Chnoupek proposed that a special economic forum be convened in Prague. The proposals from Romania -- on holding a meeting of experts to formulate measures and forms which would promote scientific and technical exchange -- and from Bulgaria -- on ecological problems -- have been receiving support. There has been interest in the ideas expressed by Italy, the FRG, and others. The convening of special forums would help to produce new incentives for the attainment in the nineties of a change in East-West economic relations of benefit to all and for promoting the concept of international economic security.

/The success of the Stockholm conference in ensuring military security inspired the Vienna meeting. Many of its participants have already proposed coming to an agreement on a mandate for moving on to the next state -- disarmament. The Warsaw Pact states' proposals, put forward in June this year, should be the basis for a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, as Greek Foreign Minister K. Papoulias noted./

Finland and other Scandinavian countries are urgently proposing that military activity in the Baltic, the northern seas, and the Atlantic be subject to the Stockholm "rules of conduct." The USSR's new practical actions in this sphere, the proposals to strengthen confidence in northern Europe, and to limit naval activity have been received at the Vienna meeting as important steps requiring reciprocity.

When determining the mandate for the second stage of the Stockholm conference it is also necessary to extend confidence-building measures to independant air force and naval exercises and to reach agreement on limiting the scale of all military exercises. Thought must also be given to ways to eliminate the inequality which has emerged in the application of confidence-building measures between the European countries and the non-European countries -- the United States and Canada.

After the general discussion ended at the Vienna meeting a thorough exchange of opinions began on what had been done and what has still to be done. /Like the entire all-European process, the Hofburg forum is a special school not only of the new political thinking but also of a new creative and bold practice on the scale of the whole continent./ And the degree of its success will determine how far Eruope will become a model for the creation of a universal sysstem of security and cooperation, one worthy of imitation. Thus, we wish this important work success!

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION -- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD230016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 21 Nov 86

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program, conducted by Konstantin Patsyuk, all-union radio commentator, with Rafail Nadzhipovich Moseyev, international affairs journalist; Professor Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanovich, Dr of Economics, Deputy Director of the United States and Canada Institute fo the USSR Academy of Sciences; Sergey Pravdin (not further identified); and commentator Pavel Kasparov]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Patsyuk] On 22 November it will be the 43d anniversary of the official declaration of the Lebanese Republic. [passage omitted]

[Moseyev] Tel Aviv continues to occupy a considerable part of the territory of southern Lebanon. The aggressor and its hirelings of the puppet Army of Southern Lebanon, who have dug themselves in in the so-called security zone are trying to force the Shi'ite Muslims who live there to quit their home localities. This barbarous scorched earth tactic is pursuing the aim of breaking the will of the Lebanese patriots who have unleashed partisan warfare against the occupiers and their hirelings.

All of this is based on the calculation of bringing a weakened and dismembered Lebanon under its political, economic and military control. The overheated atmosphere constantly threatens new flare-ups in the Near East and this is to the advantage of Tel Aviv and its stragegic ally, the United States.

In short, the situation in Lebanon and in other regions of the Near East remains tense. This is shown in particular by the propaganda hysteria that has been unleashed by the West, primarily by the United States, against Syria.

While whipping up tension in Lebanon and continuing armed pressure upon it, the Zionist circles in the West have recently been trying to blackmail Syria, too, and to frighen its people. Recently, the British government, which had dug up from somewhere some old facts, tried to accuse Syria of preparing a terrorist act at London's Heathrow Airport. However, it turned out that this was a deliberate lie. It was aimed against a state whose independent and anti-imperialist course was clearly not to the taste of those who would like to establish unlimited dominatin in the Near East.

The anti-Syrian fuss London organized was a preplanned and carefully prepared plot, the Arab press writes. It was inspired by the United States and Israel. By their attempts to blackmail the Syrian people, Washington and Tel Aviv would like to push the Arab states onto the path of separate deals modelled on Camp David, and to revive the so-called Reagan Near East Initiative, which is resolutely opposed by Syria.

The anti-Syrian campaign has been unleashed at a moment when there is increasing support for the idea of convening an international conference on a Near East settlement. The participants in this should be the permanent members of the Security Council and all interested sides in the region, including, of course, Syria.

[Patsyuk] It is clear that just as before, the path of a political resolution of the Near East problem is not to the liking of Washington or Tel Aviv.

[Moseyev] That is indeed so. At present, Israel, under the cover of the propaganda fuss of the so-called West European sanctions, has begun military preprations against Syria. In this regard the statement made by Prime Minister Shamir is of interest. He spoke a few days ago to an AP correspondent. The Israel hawk frankly admitted that the probability of a strike against Syrian territory was by no mean ruled out.

[Patsyuk] And what is the reaction of the Syrians to the pressure being put on them?

[Moseyev] The campaign of blackmail was calcuated to intimidate the Syrians, to cause panic and confusion. However, in fact it had the opposite effect. The economic and personnel potential of the country, its moral and psychological resources, its staunchness and endurance are being mobilized. [passage omitted]

[Patsyuk] Rafail Nadzhipovich, many political observers are pointing attention to the fact that the anti-Syrian sanctions are being undertaken at the very moment when the scandal of Washington's arms supplies to Iran is developing.

[Moseyev] It is quite clear that by fanning up the anti-Syrian campaign, the U.S. Administration would like to distract the public's attention from the latest scandal. The Arab states were shocked by the facts of the supply of U.S. weapons to Tehran. This is shown in part by the utterances of King Husayn of Jordan. He described this as an unexpected and sorry development. BBC correspondent Taylor in his report from Amman was forced to admit that another blow had been struck against the trust of the Arab states, including the moderate ones, in the Reagan Administration. The arms supplies to Iran and the previous failures of U.S. policy in the region have placed the U.S. Administration in a very difficult situation, and it is now making very clumsy attempts to justify its country's Near East policy.

[Patsyuk] It is characteristic that Israeli Defense Minister Rabin admitted that Israel helped in the delivery of U.S. weapons to Iran. Speaking to journalists on this subject, he stressed that if a vert friendly country asks us to do something, we help it. Thus we see yet another fact confirming that Israel and the United States act in concert. Their strategic interests are aimed against the Arab countries, and inherent in them is a threat to the security of the Near East.

Ilya Mikhaylovich Chumakov, of Moscow, asks about the attitude of the U.S. Democratic Party regarding the SDI program. We've asked the deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Prof Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, Dr of Historical Sciences, to tell us about it.

[Bogdnaov] I take it that the question is evidently prompted by the fact that the Democratic Party has once again gained a majority in the Senate. I think it's a natural question to ask, and one that is of some interest. Ever since President Reagan put forward the SDI program in March 1983, most leading members of the Democratic Party has been critical of it in one degree or another. But nowhere in the party's official documents is its generally negative position on SDI actually on record. Nonetheless, not one of the influential Democrats has supported the SDI program unconditionally, and so there is reason to assume that the attitude of the Democrats to this question, which they will have to formulate before the presidential election in 1988, will also reflect to some extent this critical stance in relation to SDI.

There are certain differences in the approaches of the various groupings within the Democratic Party to the SDI program. At least three main tendencies can be distinguished: First, there are the Democrat experts on military policy, Senator Nunn and Congressman Aspin, who supported the limiting of allocations for SDI in the financial year 1987 to less than the adminstration had asked for. The amount was cut by 34 percent. But, on the whole, their criticism of the program has been muted, being mainly concerned with its technical aspects and the financial expenditure involved. After the meeting in Reykjavik, Aspin expressed his opinion thus: I think a lot of people are going to say that it was a fairly good deal. Nunn warned that after Reykjavik the Congress would watch and criticize Star Wars more than ever before, and that allocations for the program would run into considerable difficulties. Outside Congress, the line taken by Nunn and Aspin has the support of such leading Democrat experts on military policy as Brown, Laird, Schlesinger and Scowcroft, who are in favor of observing SALT II and the ABM Treaty, but also of modernizing strategic arms systems. There is also a good deal of opposition to the SDI program among Democrat members of the Congress occupying centrist positions. Concern about the vast expenditure that would be needed to implement the SDI program is the dominant motive for such opposition on the part of the centrist Democrats.

And that is the second tendency. In particular, there's the characteristic position of Senator Proxmire, who has been opposing SDI for several years. He considers that the arguments of the program's supporters purporting to show that it is economically attainable and motivated by a desire to plunder the treasury. In May of this year, Proxmire published an article in CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR in which he said that the main defects of SDI were the vulnerability of the space-based systems and the fantastically vast cost of the program. He wrote in conclusion: Even these fantastic expenditures on Star Wars would give us a system that won't protect us from a devastating nuclear strike; meanwhile, SDI will cancel out any substantial progress on arms control.

Johnston and Proxmire were the organizers of a letter that was sent by a large group of senators to the Armed Forces Committee in May of this year, insisting that SDI allocations for the coming financial year should not be increased by more than 3 percent.

The letter was orginally signed by 46 senators, and later by 2 more. Among the Democrat Senators who signed it were not only liberals and centrists, but also moderate conservatives like Chiles, Bentsen, Long, Ford, Leahy, Levine, Kennedy, and others. The position of the centrist Democrats in the Congress on SDI is supported by the think tank of the Democrats in the Congress on SDI is supported by the think tank of the Democratic party, the Brookings Institution. The director of this foreign policy research program, Steinbrunner, advocates limiting the SDI program to laboratory research over a 10-year period. Criticism of the feasibility of SDI has been voiced by the well-known scientists Blackman and (Wadgoff). The position of Johnston, Proxmire and the other authors of the senators' letter to the Armed Forces Committee has been supported by the Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control, to which the Union of Concerned Scientists, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and a number of other organizations of experts belong.

It is a notable fact that the Democrat Senator Pell, who will soon take up the post of chairman of the Senator Foreign Relations Committee in the new Congress, occupies a position envisaging a certain caution regarding SDI. Commenting on the meeting in Reykjavik, Pell said: This is a sad day for mankind. As I said a year ago the obvious compromise was, is, and will remain, to achieve a serious reduction in strategic offensive weapons in exchange for an equivalent limitation of the Strategic Defence Initiative. What is amounts to is that we've lost a bird in the hand by chasing two in the bush, in other words, SDI.

The third tendency is represented by the liberal wing of the Democrats in the Congress, led by such figures as Hart and Biden, and in the Senate by Downey, Markey, Dellus, Brown and others. They have opposed the SDI program from the moment Reagan proclaimed it. The members of Congress belonging to this group are against SDI because it is consequences that will destabilize international security, and because of the threat to mankind posed by an arms race in space. The liberal Democrats have actively supported all proposals to cut congressional allocations for the SDI program. Senator Hart's appraisal of that program is of interest, since he is at present seen as a potential Democrat candidate for the presidency in 1988. Hart said after Reykjavik that the President has missed a unique opportunity to conclude a stupendous arms control agreement, and, as a result, he has driven us into a corner for the sake of protecting a highly theoretical and extremely costly program that won't be able to show its viability at least, and at best, until the end of the century.

[Patsyuk] Regular listener Nikolay Vasiliyevich Salyamov from the town of Bogotol, Krasnoyarsk Kray, who participated in the Great Patriotic War, asks about the reasons for the war between Iran and Iraq. [passage omitted] It is noteworthy that he flames of war flared up at a moment that was very convenient for internationl reaction. They flared up soon after the Iranian revolution which, as is known, greatly undermined U.S. positions in the Near and Middle East. There was a need for grounds to restore its shaken positions there, and to intensify the U.S. military presence in that region. And then, very handily for the United States, the war started. Under the pretext of the threat to oil supplies from the region to Western countries, the United States, the Under the pretext of the threat to oil supplies from the region to Western countries, the United States declared the Persian Gulf zone of its vital interests. It moved a strong naval grouping there, and it is on combat readiness for a large part of the time.

The Iran-Iraq combat activities are constantly increasing in scale. One and a half million men are taking part from the two sides as well as 5,000 tanks and thousands of aircraft. According to U.S. press estimates, over 1 million Iranians and Iraqis have already been killed. Vast materials damage has been caused to both sides.

The question arises: is there some way to extinguish this conflict, which has already lasted 6 years Of course there is. But imperialist forces are doing everything possible to further inflame it.

The West, primarily the United States, is artificially whipping up the feelings of hostility beteen Iran and Iraq, and is conducting a campaign of disinformation. As THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote quite frankly: The military conflict is exhausting the strength of he two countries and this is in accord with the interests of the United States in ths region of the world. Therefore, any method is acceptable to whip up the conflict. he NATO countries are supplying more and more consignments of weapons to the conflictng sides, encouraging them to intensify military activities.

Facts revealed recently show that the United States had secretly -- and circumventing Congress ad the executive -- supplied weapons and military equipment to Iran. The administraion tried to explain its actions by saying that it was guided by the interests f establishing a just peace in the region. This is pure demagogy. It was not at al peace that the administration was thinking about when it helped Iran with weapons o the quiet. It was trying to exhaust the strength of the combatant sides, to weaken th Near East countries' front of opposition to the U.S.-Israeli onslaught on that regin.

Our coutry and many other countries of the international community which are UN members re making efforts to put an end to this bloody and cruel war. Recently the UN Securit Council adopted a resolution that proposed an immediate cease-fire and the cessatin of all military actions on land sea and air, and the withdrawal of all troops to the internationally recognized borders. Our country considers that there is every possibility for a peaceful resolution of the quarrel between Iran and Iraq while taking accoun of their legitimate interests. [passage omitted]

[Patsyk] Comrade Boguslavskiy from the town of Chernigov enquires why our country does ot protest to the United States over its conducting an undeclared war against Nicaria.

It mt be said that from the very first days this war was unleashed, our country has resoltely condemned Washington, which for various fictitious pretexts is interfering in t internal affairs of this sovereign Central American republic.

One f the allegations used to vindicate U.S. interventionist actions against Nicaragua come down to claiming that there is increasing Soviet military presence in that coutry. The recent Soviet Government statement repudiates such allegations, which are totlly groundless. The U.S., the statement says, has not created and is not creating in Nicaragua any military bases of any sort. In other words, this fabrication is noting other than an attempt to turn everything upside down and to justify the increase in U.S. interference in Nicaragua. The USSR has once again confirmed its firm solidarity with the just cause of the people of Nicaragua and its readiness to continue tgive them help and support in their struggle for freedom and independence. [passage ortted]

BOGACHEV URGES U.S. TO DISCUSS WEAPONS BAN

LD251022 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS military news analyst:

An analysis of the developments of the past weeks in the field of limitation and reduction of weapons shows that Washington has responded with a step back from its previous stand to every attempt made by the Soviet Union to meet the United States halfway in order to facilitate the quest for mutually-acceptable decisions.

That was precisely the U.S. Administration's reaction to the USSR's proposals that Soviet and American missiles be eliminated in Europe and they be drastically reduced on the global scale. The USA has also been departing from its own stand recently on the issue of a cut and then a total elimination of all strategic offensive weapons. They in Washington are trying to remove part by part the package of Soviet proposals, take from the negotiating table what seems more beneficial to them and disregard what goes against the grain with them for different reasons.

At Reykjavik the Soviet side again raised the question on the issue of the start of talks on a total ban on nuclear blasts. A ban on nuclear tests would strengthen the climate of confidence in international relations, would serve as an effective barrier in the way of unfolding the nuclear weapons race.

Demonstrating its goodwill, being guided by the wish to set an example to all the other nuclear powers, the Soviet Union has for fifteen months and a half now strictly observed the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Over that period, the USA has twenty-three times thrown a challenge to world public opinion, by exploding nuclear devices in the Nevada test-range.

Wishing to justify at least in a way its stand on the question of nuclear blasts, Washington started talking of the need, as it claims, to reach agreement first on a stage-by-stage cut in the number and yield of nuclear blasts. During the summit meeting in Reykjavik the Soviet side proposed that talks be started on a total ban on the tests and, wishing to meet the USA halfway, expressed preparedness to discuss at some stage of these talks also the question of their limit number a year and the "thresholds" of their yield.

As a result of the Soviet initiatives the stands of the sides might seem to draw closer. Yet on that issue too, the Reagan administration began going back on its word, apparently reluctant to agree even to talks on a total ban on all nuclear explosions.

While continuing to confuse people about the results of the Reykjavik meeting, the U.S. Administration is now deliberately distorting the events at Reykjavik. Thus, in particular, they in Washington are trying to convince world public that the Soviet side has expressed full consent to the present-day U.S. policy of endlessly continuing nuclear blasts.

The Soviet Union is a convinced opponent of nuclear tests and, certainly, has never given any consent to an endless continuation of U.S. nuclear explosions. This has never been and could not be the case.

The world is now approaching a new important line -- the term of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions will expire in five weeks. Washington has enough time to weigh soberly the consequences of its dangerous policy and consent to talks on a total prohibition of nuclear tests.

Nuclear blasts in test ranges should be ended completely and everywhere in the long run. This will seriously put off the danger of nuclear explosions over the cities of our planet.

FURTHER REPORTAGE OF IRAN ARMS SALE CONTROVERSY

Kornilov Comments

LD251213 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 24 Nov 86

[""Irangate" -- The Scandal Grows" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Nov (TASS) -- TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

"Reagan's advisors have come to the conclusion that these are the gloomist times in the President's political career." This is what THE WASHINGTON POST writes today, describing the political atmosphere in Washington. Indeed, they are currently going through gloomy times in the White House. The higher the waves of the political scandal over secret supplies of U.S. arms to Iran, the more obvious it becomes that the Republican administration has lost and continues to lose trust even in those circles in its own country which just recently were giving it their support.

This is objectively determined. Was it such a long time ago that Washington was assuring all and sundry that it was adhering to a position of "neutrality" and of rejecting the supply of arms to the parties in the Iran-Iraq conflict? Was it such a long time ago that it was calling on other countries, including its own allies, to observe this prohibition? It is now obvious to everyone that the U.S. ruling circles have been conducting an unseemly double game behind the scenes. In trying to gain the levers of power over the sources of Near East oil and to regain the opportunity of exerting a decisive influence on Tehran's policies, they have been deceiving their own people and their own congress, not to mention the international community. But lies and double dealing in politics always boomerang. The indecent double game has resulted, as polls show, in more than 80 percent of Americans no longer believing the architects of U.S. foreign policy. Unprecedentedly sharp criticism of this course is growing throughout the world -- including in countries allied to the United States. "Both Americans and the whole world now have serious reason to doubt the qualitative side of the policies of those who hold positions of authority in Washington," the British FINANCIAL TIMES notes.

"Irangate" is only one of the examples of the fact that U.S. foreign policy is literally permeated with falsehood and pharisaism and that one thing is said in Washington while something altogether different is done, something that is diametrically at variance with the statements. The ruling U.S. circles have held forth to a great extent about their desire for peace, for halting the arms race -- but it is they themselves who make efforts to carry this race into space, simultaneously trying to create muddle and confusion in people's minds about the Reykjavik results.

They swear they are resolved to "put an end to international terrorism", but it is they themselves who have elevated terror to the rank of state policy, crudely interfering in the affairs of sovereign countries, organizing and waging undeclared wars against them. They call for observance of human rights -- but they themselves trample these rights underfoot in the crudest possible way, installing in power and supporting the most reactionary regimes and cliques which wage war against their own peoples -- and doing it everywhere, from South Korea to Chile.

The Republican vessel, pursuing this course, has now begun to list - and it is listing seriously; it is not something that can be concealed by propaganda buffoonery.

The tangle of Washington's Iranian adventure is continuing to unravel and supposedly we will hear and learn still more of the great many details and minutiae of this adventure. However, the real reasons for the unprecedented "crisis of confidence" now being experienced by Washington are linked -- naturally enough -- not with the tangible details of the scandal which has broken. These reasons are deeper and more serious. Their foundation is Washington's duplicitous, adventurist, and hegemonistic policy.

Seyful-Mulyukov Criticism

OW230550 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 19 Nov 86

[From "the World Today" program presented by Faird Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Two former U.S. presidents, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, spoke out in sharp condemnation against secret arms deliveries to Iran by the present Washington administration.

Thus, in an interview with NBC, Ford said he is categorically opposed to the sale, transfer, or any other forms of deals related to the delivery of weapons to Iran. Such actions, stressed the former head of the White House, are directed against Arab countries and division in U.S. relations with West European countries.

Former President Carter, who after the capture of the U.S. embassy in Tehran by guards of the Islamic Revolution, embargoed the delivery of arms to Iran, stressed that the present secret deliveries have been carried out in spite of White House official statements about U.S. neutrality in the Iran-Iraq war, and has caused in the country a crisis of confidence in the Reagan administration. The American people, Congress, and even the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not informed by the White House, said Jimmy Carter.

According to the latest opinion poll, only 14 percent of Americans believe President Reagan told the truth about secret operations with Iran.

In terms of the domestic aspects of this scandalous story, which many across the ocean are comparing with Watergate, much has been said in the past few days. But it is more important to take a look at this sinister story in regional, Near East terms. Thus, the following should be noted: When we talk about the vital interests of American imperialism or about a region that is rich in oil and occupies an important strategic position in the approaches to the southern borders of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East, the White House is prepared to forgo its legal obligations, relations with its allies, and even the lives of its citizens.

For American neoglobalists, Iran remained the number one goal in the Persian Gulf.

Now it is known that the United States encouraged secret arms delivery to Iran only 2 years after the crash of the Shah's dictatorship -- at the moment of acute worsening of U.S.-Iranian relations. These deliveries were carried through a third country, particularly via Israel. Israel's government is concerned above all with confrontation with the Arab world, little by little maintained contacts with certain Iranian circles, and erected bridges between Washington and Tehran. This was taking place when, in the republic of the mullahs, curses against the United States calling it the Great Satan were heard.

The policies of separate deals with moderate Arab regimes, in the spirit of Camp David, and the escalation of the Iran-Iraq conflict -- these are the two pillars of present U.S. policies on the Near and Middle East.

During the last appearances of President Reagan, interviews with his closest advisers, in particular with the former national security adviser McFarlane, who was entrusted by the White House with the realization of Reagan's secret mission in Iran, it is frankly stressed that the United States is interested in controlling Iranian oil, places great importance to the neighbor of this country -- the Soviet Union, and its strategic meaning in the Persian Gulf. It was precisely these factors that dictated Washington's hypocritical policies, which lack any principles, in relations with Iran.

McFarlane made no secret that during his visit to Tehran he attempted to contact moderate factions in the Iranian leadership. Washington press goes even further, stressing that the United States is planning its Iranian policies for the period following the departure of Ayatollah Khomeyni from the political arena.

The bloody Iran-Iraq conflict has been going on for more than 6 years and has led to the loss of many lives and to the destruction of a significant part of the economic structure of both countries. The Western press has reported that nearly 10,000 enterprises in Iran have closed. The war has touched every Iranian family. Prices for the most common goods, now considered as items of luxury, have become astronomical, writes U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT. For example, a jar of coffee costs $80, while a banana costs $10. Recently, meat rations were cut, and rations on gasoline are severely limited, even though Iran is the second largest producer of oil in this region.

Discontent with the pointless war, which exhausted the strength of Iran, is growing. According to Western press reports, even within the Iranian leadership different approaches, to say the very least, exist both on questions pertaining to the Iran-Iraq conflict and to problems of foreign and domestic policies. After the unmasking of the Reagan's operation, several leaders issued statements stressing that the change in U.S. policy toward Tehran is a positive factor. But at the same time Tehran continues to call the United States the Great Satan.

All observers note the clearly Anti-arab character of the behind-the-scene U.S.-Iranian deals. Secret delivery of weapons to Iran, declared representatives of 16 Arab countries in the United Nations, are in direct breach of assurances given by Washington to the Arabs. These deliveries represent a danger to prolonging the Iran-Iraq conflict, stressed Nizar Hamdoon, Iraqi ambassador to the United States.

The White House acts in the Near East, as it does in other regions, according to the cannons of the ancient emperors of Rome -- divide and conquer.

Whitehall Condemns Sales

LD251101 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 25 TASS -- During hearings in congress on Monday, John Whitehead, U.S. deputy secretary of state, publicly criticised the U.S. secret arms shipments to Iran, undertaken on instructions from the White House and carried out under the direction of the staff of the National Security Council.

He called for gaining a clear understanding of how the staff of the National Security Council functioned and to what extent it should be involved in 'operational matters' in the sphere of foreign policy.

He also stated that the Iran operation had dealt a blow on the reputation of the U.S. President and on the prestige of the country as a whole.

The statement by the U.S. deputy secretary of state is indicative of serious differences inside the administration in connection with misgivings that the overtly adventuristic foreign policy is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences to the United States.

Crist To 'Hush Up Scandal'

LD232200 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 23 Nov 86

[Text] Cairo November 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Yefremov reports:

General George Crist, commander of the U.S. Centcom, arrived in Cairo on a five-day visit on Saturday, MENA NEWS AGENCY reported. The visit by the U.S. general is linked with two points in local political circles: the U.S. militarist activity in the region, which has been steeply intensified lately, and the exposure of the secret contacts between Washington and Tehran, of clandestine U.S. arms sales to Iran.

Using the false charges of supporting terrorism lodged against Syria, Washington has launched with the assistance of its allies and above all Israel, a frenzied anti-Syrian campaign whose goal is to intimidate not only that sovereign Arab country but also other Middle East countries.

Washington and Tel Aviv continue pouring oil on the fire of conflicts raging in the Middle East. A new proof of this has been furnished by the revelation of covert U.S. arms shipments to Iran. It is symptomatic that quite recently the same general toured countries of the Arabian Peninsula, certifying that the United States was scrupulously commited to neutrality in the Iran-Iraq war and even offered U.S. aid to fend off those countries from external threat.

Meanwhile ships and aircraft carrying U.S. missiles, war (?material and ammunition) flew in a continuous stream to Iran. [Word indistinct] goal of those efforts by the U.S. Administration is apparent -- to divert Arabs from the struggle against Israel's annexationist policy, to divide the Arab countries and the Non-aligned Movement as a [word indistinct] and to exacerbate to the extreme the situation in that explosive region.

The revelations of the duplicity of the U.S. policy sparked off an outcry in the Arab world which exerts strenuous efforts to stop this bloody and senseless war, to settle the existing differences by peaceful means. The Arab press pointed out that Washington has discredited itself (?completely) and [words indistinct] of playing a positive role in the region.

All this has worried the United States. So, it seems that this was the reason why George Crist, commander of the U.S. Centcom, arrived in the Middle East. On the one hand, he will try to hush up the scandal and, on the other, to intimidate the Arabs by reminding them that the U.S. "Rapid Deployment (?forces)", set up by the United States to invade unsubmissive countries, are on standby.

SURGUCHEV ON U.S. PLAN TO USE EUROPEAN ROCKET

LD192103 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] The Pentagon is studying the possibilities of using the West European carrier rocket Ariane for launching of its cargoes into space. Here is a Mayak commentary. Igor Surguchev is at the microphone:

The United States are making feverish efforts to maintain the high speed of implementation of its large scale military preparations in space. In pursuing this aim, it has been forced for the first time to turn for help to the European Space Agency [ESA] set up by West European countries. This is because implementation of the U.S. space research program -- which to a considerable extent serves the interests of the Pentagon -- has been brought to a sharp halt because of the disaster of the Challenger space shuttle in January this year.

After analysis of the disaster which led to the death of seven cosmonauts, it was decided to abandon launches of the Shuttle spaceships until February 1988. This is a serious blow to the plans of those in the United States who are striving for the accelerated militarization of space. The fact is that in order to make up for lost time they have been promised the use of Shuttle flights primarily for military purposes. In addition the Pentagon has been granted the use of Titan carrier rockets for launching its cargoes into space.

However, all this obviously does not satisfy the appetites of those transatlantic supporters of the creation of space strike weapons, hence their interest in the West European Ariane rocket. Why not use the space potential of the European allies, the United States reckons? Why not draw them even deeper into the implementation of its plans for the militarization of space? It is not yet clear what West Europe and the leadership of the ESA thinks about this. It is appropriate to recall that the latter was set up in the interests of international cooperation in the sphere of space research for peaceful purposes, and this does not fit in at all with carrying out the Pentagon's orders connected more directly than not with the Star Wars program which is extremely dangerous for peace.

In light of these circumstances the appeal of the U.S. military department to the ESA cannot but evoke the justified concern of the West European public who, on the whole, resolutely reject the White House course aimed at turning space into an arena of Star Wars. The attempts to draw the ESA into the implementation of the notorious SDI shows again the exceptional topicality of preserving peace in space which the Soviet Union advocates firmly and consistently.

PRC HEALTH WORKERS DELEGATION VISITS MOSCOW

OW201108 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Chinese medical scientists are watching Soviet achievements in public health. Gu Fangzhou, president of the Chinese Academy of Medical Science, said this in Moscow on 18 November when meeting with members of the Soviet Association of Health Workers and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. A Chinese medical workers delegation led by Professor Gu Fangzhou is visiting Moscow. Blokhin, president of the Soviet Academy of Medical Science, has welcomed the Chinese guests and expressed satisfaction over contacts between the Soviet and the Chinese medical workers.

Minsk Visit

OW221235 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] The visiting Chinese medical workers delegation, headed by Prof Gu Fangzhou, president of the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, left Moscow and arrived in the Belorussian capital of Minsk on 20 November. During their visit to Moscow, the Chinese guests were acquainted with the work of medical research organizations in that city. The Chinese medical workers will spend 3 days touring Minsk. They will examine health-care work in the capital of Belorussia.

INDUSTRIAL, TRADE EXHIBIT SCHEDULED FOR BEIJING

OW210619 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Excerpts] A Chinese industrial and commercial exhibition took place in Moscow this afternoon, and a Soviet industrial and trade exhibition will be held at Beijing's International Exhibition Center 12-28 December. On display at the exhibition will be exhibits that demonstrate the USSR's present industrial, scientific and technological development. Participating in the exhibition will be various Soviet foreign trade companies, some of which have been reported in our previous broadcasts. Today we will discuss another foreign trade company that will take part in the exhibition, namely the Construction Technology Import-Export Corporation. [passage omitted]

According to the company, there are good prospects for developing cooperation for mutual benefits with the PRC in the construction field. (Sibilev), general manager of the corporation, told a reporter of this station that his corporation has broadened the basis of cooperating with China's foreign trade organizations in recent years. He said: Negotiations are being conducted with China on building factories producing construction materials, including [words indistinct] and glass panes to be used on automobiles. Both sides are also discussing on cooperation in producing new type of [words indistinct] with recycled materials. Last September, a number of Chinese experts came to the USSR to study the operation of such a factory.

Cooperation on railway construction and electrification, including the construction of a railway linking the Soviet border areas with Xinjiang's Urumqi, was discussed recently when a Chinese delegation headed by Jiang Caixin, director of the capital Construction Bureau of the Ministry of Railways, was visiting the USSR. Comrade (Sibilev) said he hoped the Soviet Construction Technology Import-Export Corporation's participation in the forthcoming exhibition will provide Chinese experts a better understanding of the Soviet export capacity in the construction field.

PRAVDA REBUTS JAPANESE GOVERNMENT VIEW OF SDI

PM211459 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "The Laser and the Bullet"]

[Text] The Japanese prime minister and foreign minister, who recently had to answer questions in parliament about the government's consent to join in the U.S. "Star Wars" program, were not to be envied. The framework of the debate was as follows: The opposition took the line that Japan's participation in SDI is at variance with the "three non-nuclear principles" and the parliamentary resolution on space research and development for exclusively peaceful purposes. And the government's line was that SDI is a nonnuclear program leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Defending such a position after Reykjavik, when it became abundantly clear that the way to a nonnuclear world is barred precisely by the U.S. plans for the militarization of space, was an unenviable task. They had to twist and turn, do violence to logic, and juggle with facts. Here are some examples:

Deputy: Is it possible to describe a nuclear-pumped x-ray laser as a "nonnuclear weapon"?

Prime minister: A nuclear weapon is a weapon in which a nuclear explosion is used directly to kill people or destroy material assets. A weapon involving indirect use of a nuclear explosion cannot be described as a nuclear weapon.

Deputy: Will Japan refrain from participating in SDI if it is proved that nuclear weapons are nonetheless used as part of the program?

Prime minister: SDI as a whole is a nonuclear weapon. It serves as a means of destroying ICBM's. The x-ray laser is only one component of the system. Furthermore, it still is not competely clear what it represents.

Question: Does not joining SDI constitute an act of collective defense which is banned under the Japanese Constitution?

Foreign minister: Participation in SDI does not entail actual use of force, and therefore it does not signify the exercise of the right to collective defense...

And what about the "three non-nuclear principles"? The Japanese Foreign Ministry takes the view that they apply only to Japan. And it claims that the restrictions imposed by those principles do not apply to furnishing the United States with technology which can be used in the creation of nuclear arms.

Strange logic indeed! It appears that production is banned, but participation in production is allowed. It appears that a nuclear explosion is one thing, yet its energy transformed into lethal rays intended to destroy targets in space and on earth in something entirely different. It appears that there is no connection between a rifle and the bullet it fires. And what does the "indirect" impact of a nuclear explosion mean? After all, U.S. atom bombs were exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki rather than over Japan. But that made no difference to the fate of those who were killed or maimed.

REPORTAGE OF GORBACHEV VISIT TO INDIA CONTINUES

Interview With Journalists

PM241401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Interview by Indian Journalist" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met Indian journalists in the Kremlin on November 21 in connection with his forthcoming visit to India, and replied to their questions.

The panel of journalists consisted of Saeed Naqvi, Indian Television news analyst, A,. Baiu, special correspondent of the PRESS TRUST OF INDIA (PTI), K.G. Joglekar, special correspondent of the UNITED NEWS OF INDIA (UNI), and Harish Avasthi, director-general of All India Radio.

Mikhail Gorbachev: I would like to begin by saying that I am looking forward with much interest to a meeting with India.

Soviet people have special sentiments for India. We consider the Indian people to be our friends and reliable partners. We are happy with the way our relations are shaping up. I have already had a chance to say so and I want to repeat that relations with India are a priority in our foriegn policy. I think we can say, too, that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet leaderships with regard to India takes account of the profound sentiments of friendship our peoples have for the Indian people.

We, on the other hand, constantly sense in the Indian Government's policy that it, too, is marked by the desire to reflect those profound sentiments for our people that Indian Government's policy that it, too, is marked by the desire to reflect those profound sentiments for our people that Indian society, the Indian people have. In my view, it is the most important, the most lasting aspect of our relations -- what I mean is tradition, many-year friendship and cooperation in bilateral and international affairs.

Finally, there is a legal base for these relations -- the 1971 treaty. What I would also like to note today is the great importance of another factor of the development of these relations in the past, today and I hope, in the future. What I mean is the continuous intensive and constructive political dialogue between the leaders of our countries.

Respect for the Indian people was what motivated Lenin when he farsightedly predicted India's role in international affairs. Lenin's idea nurtured our policy line and practical actions toward India. Many generations of Soviet and Indian leaders have worked hard so that we could see our relations in such a state today.

I would like to mention Jawaharlal Nehru. His memory is revered in our country and his contribution to the development of our relations is highly valued.

The Soviet Union and India, which represent the world of socialism and the world of national liberation and development, have been fruitfully cooperating over the years, over decades in the interests of their peoples and in the interests of all the peoples. It is a good example. We want these relations to develop further, and this is the main thing.

So I am looking forward to a meeting with India. Now I would like to conclude this brief address to Indian listeners, readers and TV viewers by cordially greeting them on behalf of all the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Now let us go over to business.

Question: Mr Gorbachev, we followed with great interest your journey from Geneva to Reykjavik. They are significant landmarks. What is your idea of the further road?

Answer: You have asked the most important question to which perturbs all of us. Especially, in my view because a year has passed since the Geneva meeting.

I am now convinced that Geneva was very important. Geneva made it possible to restore the broken off political dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. That was important in itself. It there is a dialogue, there is a better understanding of each other's positions. If there is a dialogue, quests are going on. Anyway, this is the first thing that can be counted on the positive side of Geneva.

There were important agreements. What I mean is the final document. It saids, inter alia: Nuclear war must not be fought and there can be no winners in it. It was a very important political statement. It is the answer to all those who are dreaming about or at leat recognizing the possibility of small, limited, local nuclear wars. If the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States recognize that nuclear war is inadmissible, it is a very important point of departure for the formulation of a new policy that would be in accord with the nuclear-space age.

There was one more important statement: The sides will not seek military superiority. If we respect that accord, then, anyway, both sides should think not of seeking military superiority but of tackling disarmament questions on the basis of equality.

The Soviet leadership has stood by the commitments it assumed in Geneva.

I want to cite some facts to make this point. It is important to state this, too, because they have not lost their relevance today.

We have extended our moratorium more than once since Geneva. On January 15 we offered the whole world a broad 15-year program for the stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons to the point of their total elimination by the year 2000. Moreover, our proposals since Geneva contain, we think, very important ideas on other aspects of the struggle against the arms race. What I mean is Stockholm, where we made constructive proposals as well. They made it possible to end that important forum successfully. I think highly of the significance of Stockholm. We furthermore substantially contributed to advancing towards agreements on the banning and elimination of chemical weapons.

All this has taken place since Geneva.

Finally, last summer we made jointly with other socialist countries major proposals on cuts in conventional armaments and armed forces. What I have just mentioned is enough to show that the Soviet leadership has acted responsibly since Geneva. But there was no real progress on nuclear weapons, on the scaling down of the nuclear arms race. [paragraph continues]

I mean primarily the Geneva talks on these problems, which were virtually deadlocked. But even in that situation we acted constructively and responsibly. I offered the U.S. President, in view of the Geneva deadlock situation, to meet without delay, leaving aside all business. What business can be more important when the fate of the world; the fate of human civilization is at stake! It was necessary to evaluate what was taking place in Geneva and give a fresh impetus to those talks so as to get the entire process moving.

I want to note -- and we duly appreciated this -- that President Reagan accepted our proposal. This was important in itself. We do not want to take all the credit. There would have been no meeting if there had not been the consent and willingness on the part of the U.S. President.

Immediately after the Reykjavik meeting I said at a press conference: With all the drama of that meeting, it led us to new frontiers of the understanding of problems and first and foremost demonstrated that agreements, even on difficult problems, were possible. I stand by this statement today. That was the most important meaning of Reykjavik.

I regret our partners causing confusion and a mess in the minds of people not only in America but all over the world about the results of Reykjavik. It disappoints me. But the President and the incumbent administration as a whole do not seem free to make decisions.

I have said so and want to repeat: Let America think, let it weigh everything and let it make a responsible decision.

All our proposals are still standing. But we want to move on forward. There are opportunities for such a movement. They have been opened, the world as a whole has been seen them and wants that movement. But we are being pulled backward from Reykjavik. The American Administration has altogther forgotten what we talked about in Reykjavik, or rather is making believe that other things were under discussion there.

But there are in European countries, too, politicians who have got scared by such a fast and strong advance of the Soviet Union and the United States in their search for accords both on strategic and on medium-range missiles. Now they would like anew to return to all that which killed -- well, not killed but rendered ineffective -- the Geneva talks.

Our main task, the task of the Soviet Union and the Soviet leadership, as we see it, is to preserve everything positive achieved in Reykjavik and to finish the building the foundation bricks of which were laid there.

Question: It is claimed in some circles that SDI is so important, actually decisive to American science and technology that is simply cannot be subject to negotiations. It is not my view, but there is a powerful lobbying pushing this idea. What is your opinion?

Answer: Generally speaking, every new weapon advances equipment and technology to some extent. Thus, in my viewe, is elementary. But I want to put it differently. Let us think about the price that America and the world have to pay for those technological achievements which the administration intends to score by launching another round of the arms race and developing space weapons, which can lead the world to the brink of unpredictable consequences.

Can you, India's representatives agree to this? The whole of sensible mankind cannot agree to such a price so that American industry and science can scale some technological summits.

Cannot those technological, technical, and scientific summit be scaled through a peaceful space exploration program? This is just what we propose. The Soviet Union has submitted a well known proposal in the United Nations.

We are in a position to judge with this with competence. We are on the first-name basis with space, so to speak, we have long been working in the field, in particular, cooperating with India.

If this is so, if technological breakthroughs can be achieved through peaceful space exploration, through international cooperation in the field, the question to ask is what is the true interest of the U.S. Administration behind SDI? The point is not technology. Large numbers of scientists in America and all over the world understand this.

The American Administration and the military-industrial circles in the U.S. wants to overtake the Soviet Union to rush ahead and to achieve military superiority through outer space. America is not happy with strategic parity and equal security. Johnson said in his day that the nation which would dominate space would also dominate the earth. It is an obsession with politicians and representatives of the military-industrial complex. This is the crux of the matter, and we cannot agree to this. I don't think anyone can agree to this. Also, they are trying to serve this SDI project in the packaging that the economy and ultimately the people will stand to gain. But it is a lie. Moreover, it is not only a lie but the main obstacle in the way of agreements which we were about to reach in Reykjavik.

Militarily SDI means another round of the arms race, a breakthrough to weapons of new types, to space weapons. Clearly, it will not lower international tension but push it up even higher. Politically, if the SDI program is carried through what is the point of conducting talks at all? Who will agree to make the task of the military-industrial complex and militaristic adventurists easier? SDI will destabilize the strategic situation and, far from strengthening trust, will subvert it even more. It will sow suspicion. Uncertainties will worsen. The situation which could develop would be fraught with rash decisions. Ths is why the Americans and the world community as a whole should weigh everything and realize where SDI is pushing the world.

Finally, the economic aspect of SDI is important as well. It is a truly voracious monster. According to American figures, at least one trillion dollars will be spent on it, whereas other estimates put the figure at two trillion dollars. It will hit America and those countries which will be forced to take part in that race as well. Lastly, the problems and needs of the developing world will remain. And those problems and needs of the developing world will remain. And those problems are crying out for attention. I think that the American people themselves, the Soviet people and the world community should reject this plan.

SDI does not scare us. We have thought out what we should do if the Americans keep working on SDI. But it will not be our choice. America is pushing the world towards action with unpredictable consequences. And the world should know this.

We value India's position very much. I must say that the voice of the peace-loving India in these months of pointed struggle over the way which the world should be follow is a factor of immense importance and a great asset.

We know and appreciate the position of the Delhi Six. I want to say, incidentally, that we have received all their addresses and replied to them. The Soviet Union shares the worry of India, of the Delhi Six, and is prepared to cooperate in a search for solutions to these urgent problems.

Question: In your televised statement on October 22 and in recent remarks by Mr Shevardnadze there was a glimmer of hope in spite of the American attempts to retreat from Reykjavik and in spite of the complex current situation in general. Today you are sounding somewhat more disappointed, I would say. Am I right? You are more angry, more outraged today than you were recently.

Answer: I would like my tone to convey worry. My positions remain the same. I, like all my colleagues in the Soviet leadership, am very worried lest the results of Reykjavik are really drowned in a stream of discourses, unimportant and trifling, the purpose of which is not to let this process emerge onto a straight path to a better world but to befuddle public opinion and detract from the results of the meeting. This worry explains my tone. But we are incorrigible optimists. We are committed to a peace-loving line and we will still do a good deal to preserve and advance this process. But, as the saying goes, a bridge must be built from both sides.

Question: You are speaking about the need for new thinking and new approaches in foreign policy. We have much interest in your statements in this vein, such as your speech in Vladivostok. How does all this show in Soviet policy in Asia?

Answer: It is an interesting, important and very significant question.

Our new thinking, as we understand it, is based on the realities of our age. We all are in one boat. The nuclear-space age has faced all of us, not just some individual countries, with the problem of the preservation and survival of humanity. It is our common problem. That is why we address in our foreign policy the international community as a whole. It is our common task to save human civilization from nuclear catastrophe.

Or take ecological problems. They are staring us full in the face. These problems also can be resolved only through cooperation among all countries. The problems of poverty, underdevelopment and backwardness -- problems affecting entire continents -- cannot be left untended and unresolved. They are banging on the doors and windows of world politics, so to speak.

We are all different, each professing a certain ideology, recognizing one political system or another and following one system of religious beliefs or another. All this is so. Nevertheless, we all are very dependent on one another today. Hence, we should think differently. We should vigorously search for approaches to building new international relations.

I think that all this process is unrealistic without the energetic participation in this building by the peoples and countries of such an immense continent as Asia. Indeed, Asia is India, China, the Soviet Union, billions of people, many nations and states. Incidentally, after exchanges of views with Mr Rajiv Gandhi, with whom we talked these problems over twice and, I think, we reached the understanding: however difficult this process in Asia can be (and it is really far from easy) we nevertheless have to launch a search for new solutions in that continent on the entire front. I tried to put our idea of it across in the Vladivostok speech.

We have now energized a political dialogue with many countries in Asia, with small and medium-sized countries too. We, naturally, count on India's great contribution and on our cooperation here. We are making our ideas of the Asian process known to China as well.

We recognize that every country has the right to choose independently and to decide its destiny, political system and state structure. This should be the point of departure. We reject any attempt at intervention in the affairs of countries and their internal processes. We see how difficult it is, always involving struggle and obstacles. We are on the side of the peoples looking for ways of resolving their national probems. No one can deny them this right.

Our foreign policy in Asia, too, is built on these principles.

There are regional problems. We want them to be resolved and settled by political means. I think it will be a very difficult and long process on the whole, but it is inevitable and necessary. Once more: the way processes will develop in the Asian region will depend to a large extent on the direction that will be taken in general by the whole world in its development. We can have a more detailed discussion of the subject already in New Delhi.

Question: You are giving this interview on the eve of your visit to New Delhi. Would you now speak about Indian-Soviet relations? What is your view of these relations and their development since the time of Jawaharlal Nehru? And what is their influence on international politics today?

Answer: I already touched upon these problems to some extent at the start. But I will elaborate on what I said as this subject always is in the focus of our attention and in the center of our foreign policy activity.

Relations between the Soviet Union and India really are immensely valuable in themselves, not only to our two peoples but to the world as a whole. We are happy with our relations. We are conducting a very active and meaningful political dialogue in the spirit of profound mutual understanding. It has been characteristic of the entire period since Jawaharlal Nehru, and was continued under Indira Gandhi. And I am very glad that this active and meaningful dialogue is now being continued between the current leaders of the Soviet Union and India. I think that we have every reason to say today that our cooperation in economy and trade also is an important sphere of Soviet-Indian relatios. I do not want to go into figures and specifics now but throughout the years since India's independence we have been cooperating fruitfully in the economy. Dozens of enterprises are living monuments to this cooperation and the best argument for its efficiency. We have a prospect for cooperation in the most advanced industries.

Large-scale programs in information science, computer technology and mechanical engineering are now being carried out in the USSR. They will also help broaden our possibilities for cooperation with India. We will make some decisions, I will not say now which, during the visit.

We have always had much respect for the Indian people's struggle for their autonomy and independence, supported India's peace-loving course, and always shared its concerns for the strengthening of defense capabilities.

Our contacts in science, technology, culture and tourism are now developing on a very broad scale. All this brings our peoples closer and makes their friendship stronger.

We have had some problems in commodity turnover and trade but now the Soviet and Indian sides are working constructively and commodity turnover will grow.

I think that our cooperation and Soviet-Indian relations as a whole have a good future. The way relations with India should be built is clear to us. We view India as our great friend and value her immense contribution to the world process in every field.

Question: Mr General Secretary, I would like to turn your attention to Soviet-Indian friendship, to the treaty between our countries which was signed 15 years ago. Should one regard this treaty as an important document in the light of the current international situation?

Answer: Yes, I think the importance of that treaty goes beyond Soviet-Indian relations.

Naturally, the first thing we thought about when we signed that treaty was the interests of India and the Soviet Union. This is understandable. However, the development of cooperation on the basis of that treaty and those frontiers which we have reached in the course of its implementation enable me today to say that these relations and therefore the treaty itself are a good example for other countries. Now that we are discussing a search for ways of improving the international situation and strengthening peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, this example of cooperation and relations between states is a great asset of mankind as a whole.

We have been cooperating fruitfully over so many years and neither we have lost our independence nor India lost anything or surrendered any of her independence. But we have gained a great deal. Our relations have become a powerful factor of international politics.

The treaty is not history. It is the present day, the living practice of our time.

Question: Mr General Secretary, you spoke of Soviet-Indian relations. But I would also like to hear your suggestions for closer economic and scientific cooperation between our two countries.

Answer: Let us leave this question till New Delhi. When we have discussed everything, Mr Gandhi and I will tell you everything. Let us not outrun ourselves. It will be all the more interesting to you if our accords are presented by both sides. I hope to see you at the press conference and let us agree here and now that you will ask this question.

Question: You said at the 27th CPSU Congress about the Soviet Union's intention of withdrawing from Afghanistan. Then you announced in Vladivostok the withdrawal of a part of Soviet troops. What is your view of the situation in Afghanistan at present?

Answer: We have always had good, friendly relations with Afghanistan under all the regimes and governments. These relations remain such today. As in the past, there are two points of principle underlying our relations with Afghanistan. First, it is a neighboring country with which we have a 2,500 km-long common border. Naturally, one should always have good relations with neighbors. Second, that people, having made its choice, embarked on a road of change. It is its right.

We neither intend to have any bases in Afghanistan nor are seeking raw materials sources there. The development of events is not simple there and both you and we know their causes.

We responded to Afghanistan's call for help some time ago and temporarily sent our troops into the country at the request of its government. Of course, we are not going to stay there forever. The Afghan people and their government would hardly agree to it anyway.

We stand for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. The Afghan Government also has such an attitude. What is being done under the U.N. sponsorship -- I mean the mission of Cordovez -- is a real process. It can be a success and lead to political settlement if, of course, Pakistan and the United States are for a political settlement. But so far we see that as soon as the process begins to show signs of progress towards settlement, they immediately take measures to thwart it. I nevertheless think that the day is not far off when the question of the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan is resolved. This will simultaneously mean the solution of the question of the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

We stand for a nonaligned and independent Afghanistan. I want to say anew that we have no expansionist designs with regard to Afghanistan. This should be perfectly clear to the whole world.

Question: The world as a whole is now showing much interest in the changes introduced by you in the Soviet Union. You have characterized them in many of your statements as amounting to a revolution. Could you speak about them in more detail?

To follow up this rather general question, I also wanted to add: I learned yesterday that the USSR Supreme Soviet had passed a law on individual labor. How does your current economic policy differ from the economic policy of Lenin? And to what extent is Lenin's new economic policy an example to you?

Answer: Socialism has led our country to the level at which it is today. It is a modern country which has resolved many problems precisely in the course of socialist transformations and which has a great potential for successful continued advance, for developing its economy, resolving social and nationality questions, having dependable defenses and making a contribution to the development of today's international relations.

We are happy with our territory. We have enough, although none to spare. We have a very close-knit people with a very well-developed sense of patriotism and pride because what has been achieved in the country today has been achieved by the people.

But we are not happy already. Why? First of all, because we can achieve more. We now have a mighty economic potential and mighty science, perhaps the world's mightiest. I do not want to boast but it is not so much my view as the views voiced in the world. We have a good cadre potential. Most of our young workers have secondary or higher education. We think that using the potentialities of the planned economy, which makes it possible to make maneuvres needed to advance scientific and technological progress, to draw up correct balances, to set priorities, and to develop the social sphere, we can take another major step. I think that we relaxed a little some time ago. There emerged signs of complacency and inertia. They were a product, as it were, of our achievements, the positive characteristics and assets of our society, such as the right to work, health care, education, social security and so on. So there appeared elements of complacency.

We have passed judgement on all this at our congress.

We did the right thing. Society itself was no longer satisfied with the way our economy, political institutions and socialist democracy were functioning and with the atmosphere in work collectives. Having launched the restructuring, the party received immense support for its policy from the people because it expressed the mood of the people. It is a policy of acceleration of restructuring every area of the life of society within the framework of socialism, on the socialist basis. In short, the task is to restructure society for the better, to improve it on the basis of what we have achieved during 70 years.

Our main intention is to set our society into motion and ensure its advance to new frontiers through scientific and technological progress wedded with the planned economy and through the democratization of society.

We have drawn up and are already fulfilling very important programs for scientific and technological progress. They are embracing all the sectors. We are giving priority to engineering and computer technology, and are revising our structural policy. But what will be decisive to the fate of our plans and policy will be the way we involve man, the working people in this process. We want to achieve this in the economy through financial autonomy, through the self-management of production collectives, through expanding the practice of electing executive personnel and through a new economic mechanism. A new law on the enterprise is about to be finalized and we will submit it to a countrywide debate. The way the economy should function in today's conditions will be in that law. The main thing is the democratization of production and greater independence and responsibility of work collectives.

This approach is welcomed by the Soviet people. This process already is under way.

We want furthermore the political system, including the organs of Soviet power, public organizations, trade unions, Komsomol, women's organizatins and others, to function more efficiently.

We are thinking of setting the human factor into motion also by drastically revising [putem seryeznogo iz Meneniya] our social policy in the interests of the working people. I would say that the strengthening of social policy today is the key to the solution of many questions in society.

I must say that restructuring is going on not without difficulties. The main obstacle is mentality. The mentality which has taken shape over the years should be restructured. We are creating economic, and social, political and ideological preconditions which give us hope that this process will eventually prevail. We will achieve the restructuring of every field of society.

We attach considerable importance to questions of improving our spiritual and cultural sphere and the moral atmosphere in society. There is a very strong desire in our people for justice and for the consistent observance of the principles of socialism and the assertion of the values gained. That is why we are waging an uncompromising struggle against all kinds of negative phenomena, abuses of official position, crime, immoral behavior, violations of discipline and order, and drunkenness. Society as a whole is actively taking part in it. The new is waging battle against the old, sometimes in pointed forms, under the leadership of the party. Work within the party itself is being improved. The party is itself being restructured. And we say: All restructuring society must begin with the party. We are now making more stringent demands on the Communists. There were those who were happy with the situation, with their positions. [paragraph continued]

We have now reminded all of them of their duty to the people. This is immensely important.

Restructuring will take time and effort. But I can say with confidence that we are on the right road and have the support of the people. This support keeps growing.

We welcome everything that serves socialism and are creating preconditions for using every possibility intrinsic in our system. We will use more efficiently the instruments of planning, material incentive, social factors and possibilities offered by improvements in commodity-monetary relations. It was in that context that we passed the law on individual labor -- all within the framework of socialism.

We will keep following that road. We have no hesitation. I think all this will have in the world, for the world as a whole.

Naturally, putting forward and fulfilling these plans, we also have an interest in peace and in cooperation with other countries, socialist, developing and capitalist alike. We are open to all this.

Question: I would like to put a question about a very important region, the Middle East. Do you have any new peace initiatives for that region?

Answer: I think that the Middle East is a common concern for the whole world. I want to stress, a common problem. And in my view there has been no progress there for the simple reason that some states intended to settle the problem to their liking. Now we see that this policy of circumvention and separate deals has brought nothing good.

I think that the international community is now realizing that the solution of the problem of this very important and explosive region should be given an international dimension. I would reaffirm our constructive proposal that preparations must begin through the Security Council and the preparatory committee to convene an international conference on the Middle East.

Such a preparatory phase on the basis of bilateral contacts and multilateral exchanges of views could make it possible to produce serious proposals which would meet the interests of all states.

I think that there is today a broader understanding of the realism and efficiency of this way.

I am happy with our meeting and an opportunity to share my ideas with the Indian public as I answered your questions I think that it was a useful thing to do on the eve of my visit to India. See you in New Delhi.

Thank you.

Stops Over in Tashkent

LD241804 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Tashkent, 24 Nov (TASS) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is on his way to Delhi to pay an official visit of friendship at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and of the Indian Government, arrived in Tashkent today.

At the airport Mikhail Gorbachev and the official delegation accompanying him were met by Inamdzhon Usmankhodzheyev, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, and other comrades.

In the evening, Mikhail Gorbachev met with the republic's leadership. There was a thorough conversation on topical questions about the work of party and soviet bodies and the public organizations of Uzbekistan as well as on problems in the far-reaching restructuring of all spheres in the republic's life. Afte a lively discussion, Mikhail Gorbachev addressed those assembled with a lengthy speech.

Leaves for Delhi

LD250555 Moscow TASS in English 0549 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Tashkent November 25 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is on his way to Delhi for an official friendly visit at the invitation of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India and the Indian Government, left Tashkent today.

Arrives in Delhi

LD250936 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0659 GMT on 25 November, in an unscheduled Novosti cast, carries a live 13-minute correspondent's report with video of the arrival in Delhi of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The studio newreader introduces the report from "our special correspondents in Delhi." The correspondent delivering the following report is identified by caption as V. Ilyashenko.

As the video shows an Aeroflot IL-62M taxiing and coming to a standstill the screen carried a caption in English saying "live from New Delhi."

Ilyashenko says: "The Soviet television cameras and microphones are installed at Palam airport near the capital of the Republic of India. The Soviet IL-62 airliner has just landed. On board is Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who has come to India, on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian prime minister, and the Indian government.

"Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and Minister for External Affairs Tiwari, and other members of the country's government, members of parliament, state and political figures of India, representatives of the Indian public and members of the diplomatic corps have come to the airport to meet the eminent guest.

Also here is a group of Soviet citizens who live and work in India.

"A guard of honor from the Indian Republic's Army is lined up on the airfield." The reporter goes on to explain that the guard of honor represents all three arms of the Indian services. State flags of the USSR and India are flying. "The airport is decorated with portraits and welcoming banners."

"Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR council of Ministers; Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces; and Chernyayev, aide to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary have arrived with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev."

Video shows Gandhi among those waiting for the aircraft doors to open, then shows Gorbachev, Raisa Gorbacheva and other official coming down the aircraft steps and being welcomed by Gandhi. While video shows the above and continues with footage of Gorbachev making his way along the line of those at the airport to greet him, chatting to Gandhi, and introducing Gandhi to members of the Soviet delegation, the correspondent describes the salute as follows:

"Comrade Gorbachev and those accompanying him descend toward the Indians meeting them. The first handshakes, the first greetings on Indian soil." He describes the welcome. "Mikhail Sergeyevich, the Indian prime minister and the members of the Soviet delegation move toward those greeting them. Mikhail Sergeyevich greets the members of cabinet, the ministers of the Republic of India. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi is introduced to the members of the Soviet delegation." Ilyashenko says the weather is fine today, and that many people have come to greet the Soviet guest. "Several hundred correspondents, television and radio workers, representing virtually all the major newspapers and telegraph agencies have recently arrived in India."

Ilyashenko explains that Indian women are scattering rose petals in Gorbachev's and Gandhi's path. He says that around 400,000 people have come from Delhi and the surrounding states to greet Comrade Gorbachev on his arrival. Schoolchildren have a holiday today.

Video shows women in Indian costume scattering flower petals as Gorbachev and Gandhi proceed along red carpet. Gandhi and Gorbachev move toward platform to listen to Soviet and Indian national anthems. The correspondent says: "Mikhail Sergeyevich is moving toward the dais to take the report from the commander of the guard." While the national anthems are played video shows Rajiv Gandhi with Raisa Gorbacheva and Sonia Gandhi cutting to shot of Gorbachev alone on covered dais. A shot form behind Gorbachev shows large placards bearing pictures of him and Raisa Gorbacheva displayed around the airport tarmac.

Ilyashenko continues: "The commander of the guard gives his report to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Mikhail Sergeyevich inspects the ranks of the guard of honor of the Indian Army. On the airfield are lined up infantrymen, airmen, and sailors."

Video shows Gorbachev inspecting the guard of honor at which point the broadcast is returned to the studio with the anchorman saying: "At this time the festive welcoming ceremony is continuing."

Further on Arrival

LD251246 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0835 GMT on 25 November, in its "Novosti" newscast, broadcasts a 32-minute correspondent's report with video of CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival in Delhi. The first 13 minutes of this report is by, according to caption, V. Ilyashenko.

After showing Gorbachev inspecting the guard of honor, this broadcast goes on to show Gandhi joining Gorbachev on the dais for the welcoming speeches by the two leaders.

During the speeches by Gandhi and Gorbachev, the camera shows brief shots of Raisa Gorbacheva and Sonia Gandhi sitting side by side, with the dais surrounded by Soviet and Indian security officers. At the end of the speeches, Gorbachev and Gandhi leave the dais and walk, surrounded by security officials, along a red carpet to shake hands with a long line of officials. During this sequence, Ilyashenko quotes from Gorbachev's interview with Indian journalists, notes the results of an opinion poll among Indians on the USSR's popularity compared with that of the United States, and describes the long history of Soviet-Indian friendship.

After the handshaking, Gorbachev and his wife and Gandhi and his wife move toward a line of black limosines for the motorcycle escorted drive to the presidential palace in New Delhi. On arrival at the palace, the two leaders and their wives climb the palace steps and pose for photographers. Also standing on the steps can be seen Dobrynin, Akhromeyev, and Vorontsov. The reportage closes with a long shot of the palace.

Gorbachev Arrival Statement

LD250735 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 25 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has arrived in New Delhi today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Prime Minister Of India Rajiv Gandhi and the Indian Government. Upon his arrival he has made the following statement:

"Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,
Esteemed Mrs. Gandhi,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Friends,

"My first words on Indian soil are the words of gratitude to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi for the invitation and to you all for the warm welcome and good wishes.

"At this moment of meeting with India I want to convey friendly greetings from the people of the Soviet Union to the great Indian people.

"My visit shows, first of all, the invariability of our principled policy of friendship and cooperation with your country. Relations between India and the USSR already have quite a long record and lasting traditions. They mutually enrich and serve the interests of the two peoples".

"Following an upward trend, these relations have been at all stages a factor of international stability and peace. This is how it was in the past and this is how it is nowadays.

"The beneficial energy which is contained in Soviet-Indian cooperation is due to the fact that the cooperation is based on trust, equality, respect, and considerate attitude to the peculiarities of each other and on due regard for each other's interests.

"The cooperation is also based -- and this is very important, too -- on the fact that these interests are not counterposed to each other, and are not directed against real, legitimate interests of other countries".

"At the present stage when both the Soviet Union and India tackle large-scale tasks of their internal development, the tasks of historical importance, Soviet-Indian ties and contacts are in need of being lent a still greater dynamism.

"This is also essential to world politics in the present-day complex and dangerous international situation.

"The problems mankind is now faced with are immense, and the dangers confronting mankind are great: the nuclear threat and the problem of survival, the difficulties and misfortunes of the developing countries, West-East, North-South -- i.e. contradictions between various types of socio-political systems and the levels of their development, regional and inter-nation crises and conflicts, the problems of food, energy, and the environment".

"I think that all these complexities of the present-day world will be touched upon in this or that degree in our conversations and talks.

"And, of course, matters of Soviet-Indian relations in all their aspects, and the topical problems of Asia, the Indian and Pacific Ocean regions will be the focus of attention -- in the context of the struggle to prevent nuclear war and improve the entire international situation.

"We have already played host to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in our country, the Soviet Union. This visit of mine is a reply one. I value very much the dialogue which is taking place between us practically regularly, although we see each other not so often.

"The dialogue enables us to keep each other informed all the time of the most important questions of our international activities and bilateral relations".

"I have no doubt that continuation of the dialogue here in Delhi will lend a still greater dynamism to versatile Soviet-Indian relations and will raise still higher the role of cooperation between our two great states as a factor in world politics, as a factor of peace and universal security.

"Thank you for the ceremonial welcome and for the garlands of flowers in which we see much more than just a tribute to the ancient tradition".

Gandhi Welcoming Speech

LD251017 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 25 TASS -- Greeting Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the people accompanying him at Delhi airport, the prime minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, said:

"General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, madame Raisa Gorbacheva, our friends from the Soviet Union.

I greet you on behalf of the people of India. You represent a country and a people who have been with us through times of trouble and times of triumph. The Soviet Union has remained a tried and trusted friend in our hours of need. We welcome you also as friends who helped us build modern India. We hail you, Mr General Secretary, as a crusader for peace.

The miracles of science and the marvels of technology have knit together the destiny of the human family as never before in history. Through three decades, India and the Soviet Union have shown the world how a warm kinship can be established between neighbours, whatever the differences in their domestic, economic and social systems. Our friendship is testament to the historical imperative of a world order based on coexistence and cooperation.

In India, as in the Soviet Union change is being pushed forward without continuity being disturbed. In both our countries, the principles and values of our national endeavour are firmly rooted and well established. Therefore with confidence and conviction we have each been able to give new directions and new dimensions to our policies. Nation building is a continuous process, there must be an adaptation of past perspectives to present realities. Innovation, imagination and an alert awareness of evolving circumstances constitute the lifebreath of a dynamic society. The serious experience of war in this century has seasoned the Soviet Union's stake in enduring peace. India's heritage of tolerance, harmony, and non-violence has cast us in the role of pioneers of peace. You respect our nonalignment, we respect your consistent commitment to peace. We share a firm belief in nuclear disarmament as the essential precursor of a peace that is durable and guaranteed. For thirty years we have worked together for harmony in the world and for the welfare of our peoples. We are delighted to have you with us, we hope this glimpse of Delhi will bring you back to us often and to many different parts of India.

Long live Indo-Soviet friendship."

Meeting in Indian Parliament

LD251223 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 25 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minster Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India had a one-on-one meeting in the building housing the Indian Government today.

TASS REPORTS SITUATION 'TENSE' IN PHILIPPINES

LD241750 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Manila November 24 TASS -- The internal political situation continues to be tense in the Philippines. It worsened considerably in the past several days because of the reports about the threat of a coup facing the country. At the request of President Corazon Aquino, all the 25 members of the cabinet of ministers, including Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile, tendered their resignation. Aquino emphasized today that she would take the toughest measures against those who tried to destabilize the government.

Andrianov Commentary

LD250211 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 24 Nov 86

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Vitaliy Sobolev; Boris Andrianov commentary]

[Text] The mass media of the West, and particularly of the United States, are clearly trying in their reports from Manila to get away with a purely superficial account of the facts that characterize the situation in the Philippines. They do not trouble themselves with an analysis of the events that are taking place there. UPI, for example, citing its own sources, has reported that the participants in the plot that was uncovered in Manila were a group of army officers and supporters of former President Marcos. They are supposed to have been intending to declare Minister of National Defense Enrile as head of the new government and in so doing, to devalue the post of the present president, Corazon Aquino, to a purely nominal appointment. This interpretation would suggest that the roots of the plot lay on the surface, that they lie in the personal ambitions of the former chief of the military department. It is not excluded, of course, that Enrile's desire to achieve supreme power did, to some extend, determine the actions of the conspirators. Not for nothing has this minister, in the course of the last few weeks, launched open attacks on the government and President Aquino on several occasions. He even threatened to break off all relations with them to provoke a political crisis in the country. Regarding this, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that Enrile assuredly wanted to remove the president from power.

However, everything of course does not rest with Enrile alone. Suffice it to recall what it was that led to the intensification of disagreements and to the start of open dissension in the upper echelons of power in Manila. This occurred after the publication of the draft of the new constitution, on which it was intended to hold a general national referendum. In particular, the draft envisions a ban on nuclear weapons being stationed on the Philippines. A bitter struggle developed around this position -- on the nonnuclear status of the country. Now the antiwar movement is gaining an ever more mass nature on the Philippine archipelago, under the slogan "the elimination of all U.S. military bases." This has shaken the United States badly. Judging by everything, it is for this reason that Washington has begun to exert ever greater pressure on the Filipino military men, with the aim of making them tighten their control over the country and crush the democratic processes that are gaining strength. Incidentally, in the Philippines itself, these processes scare fairly influential quarters who are afraid of even the promise of some reforms given by President Corazon Aquino. And that means the present situation on the Philippines has a direct link with the activity of internal reaction and with the intriguing of the ruling quarters of the United States.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON VISIT OF NETHERLANDS' LEADER

Further on Talks With Ryzhkov

PM241601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 4

["Talks in Moscow" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Talks were started in the Kremlin on 20 November between Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Rudolph Lubbers, prime minister of the Netherlands. The sides raised principled questions connected with the development of bilateral Soviet-Dutch relations and with the present-day international situation after the Reykjavik meeting.

The USSR and the Netherlands belong to different alliances and in many respects assess differently the world developments, which, however, is no obstacle for the development of a constructive dialogue on the key problems of peace and security. The heads of government emphasized the special importance of the consolidation of trust between the European East and West for resolving the priority task of today -- the removal of the nuclear war threat. With this in view it is important to understand better the policy and actions of each other.

Nikolay Ryzhkov stressed that the new comprehensive proposals of the Soviet Union on nuclear and space weapons based on the Reykjavik accords open an opportunity to achieve in a short period of time a decisive breakthrough in the sphere of disarmament starting from the level that was already reached. The return to the obsolete schemes and approaches should not be permitted.

The common opinion was expressed concerning the role that Europe and every European country could play in the present responsible moment, when it is actually being decided how quickly the historic development will approach the creation of a nuclear-free world. The similarity of the sides' views on the question of the banning of nuclear explosions, on the need for the consolidation of the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the banning of chemical weapons was reaffirmed.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and the prime minister of the Netherlands positively assessed the state of the bilateral relations in a number of spheres, such as economy, trade, science and culture. They expressed the intention of the governments of both countries to exert efforts for working out and using new forms of economic cooperation, for instance, production cooperation, the creation of joint enterprises and so on. They emphasized the need for the activation of contacts in the humanitarian sphere, of cultural and scientific ties, and of exchanges in the sphere of education and sports.

Taking part in the talks were, on the Soviet side: N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission; B.I. Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; A.I. Blatov, USSR ambassador to the Netherlands, and N.N. Afanasyevskiy, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry First European Section; [paragraph continues]

On the Netherlands side: H. Van Den Broek, foreign minister; H. Wijnaendts, foreign ministry director general for political affairs; F.A. Engering, ministry of economic affairs director general from foreign economic relations; J.P.M.H. Merckelbach, adviser to the prime minister; M.J.D. van der Voet, chief director of the government information service; J.J. Groeneveld, ministry of agriculture and fisheries director for the processing and marketing of agricultural products; A.J. Ettema, director of the foreign ministry department for Atlantic cooperation and international security; and other officials.

The talks will be continued.

Ryzhkov Kremlin Dinner Speech

FM251021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

["In a Friendly Atmosphere" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A dinner in honor of Ruud Lubbers, prime minister of the Netherlands, and his wife was given by the Soviet Government in the Grand Kremlin Palace 20 November.

Ruud Lubbers was accompanied by Hans van den Broek, minister of foreign affairs of the Netherlands, and other Dutch officials.

The Soviet side was represented by Nikolay Ryzhkov and wife, Eduard Shevardnadze, Nikolay Talyzin, Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, a first deputy chairman of the Council of ministers of the USSR, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, ministers, and chairmen of state committees of the USSR; and other officials.

A speech was delivered by Nikolay Ryzhkov, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Speech by N.I. Ryzhkov [subhead]

On behalf of the Soviet Government, I sincerely welcome the high representatives of the Netherlands, a country whose people have made a noticeable contribution to the development of European and world civilization; the land of Rembrandt, Spinoza and Desiderius Erasmus, whose heritage is a bright portion of the intellectual and cultural wealth of the whole of mankind.

It is the first visit of a Dutch head of government to our country. In one way or another, it is turning over a new page in the history of Soviet-Dutch relations. Talking about history, trade between our peoples has played a special role in the growth of peaceful relations between them. The prestige of Dutch merchants on the Russian market was so great that Russia granted them the privileges, usually called "the most-favored-nation treatment" today, as far back as the late 17th century. A Dutch brig was the first foreign ship to enter the harbor of St. Petersburg when the city still was under construction. It was from the Dutch that Russian shipbuilders and builders of shipping and irrigation canals were learning in the times of Peter the Great.

Our countries have never been at war with each other but usually joined forces in days of grim trials. That was what took place in the years of the Second World War, too, when hundreds of Soviet people were fighting side by side with the Dutch in the resistance movement in the Netherlands for the right of our peoples to freedom, independence, and a life of peace.

The Soviet Union and the Netherlands belong to different social systems and military and political alliances. This, however, should be no obstacle to serious businesslike cooperation and a joint search for ways to improve the international situation. We have commendable achievements in bilateral cooperation, specifically in the agro-industry. We hope that the Soviet-Dutch talks which have begun and agreements which we will sign tomorrow will offer opportunities for the broadening and invigoration of this cooperation.

Naturally, relations between our countries are not confined to trade and economic matters, important as they are. At a time of dangerous world tensions, cooperation in international affairs should remain central to our dialogue.

There is need today for a new approach to many problems of our world. This is natural because the fates of the states of Europe and the world as a whole are intertwined so closely that group, bloc, and ideological interests should recede in the nuclear-missile age before the awareness that peace is the highest value.

The meeting in Reykjavik, where the Soviet Union proposed a package of carefully balanced and interlinked proposals on nuclear disarmament, demonstrated that we had never been closer to beginning to abolish nuclear weapons. Whatever one's attitude to Reykjavik may be -- and there are those who are already trying to misrepresent and debase the meaning of the accord reached there -- it is beyond doubt that the Iceland meeting led the talks on nuclear disarmament to new frontiers. These frontiers must be defended today so that there should be no return to endless and fruitless discussions over the problems of disarmament against the background of the escalating arms race. Our stand is that progress should be made perseveringly and talks continued on the entire range of problems of nuclear and space weapons from the positions made clear in Reykjavik. Every country shoud most responsibly make its choice in that major undertaking. While the U.S.A., chasing military superiority, has cast its lot with the SDI program, Europe cannot help pondering the irreversible consequences of such a step.

The complex of our proposals, including those on the elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, is offering the prospect of ridding the continent of nuclear weapons and clearing the way to detente. Dutch official spokesmen, as far as we remember, vigorously advocated such a prospect some time ago. All the Europeans stand to gain from efforts to achieve relevant agreements and have them implemented as soon as possible.

The arguments that Western Europe will feel "defenseless" without American nuclear weapons in the face of the armed forces and conventional armaments of the Warsaw Treaty countries do not sound convincing today either. Our proposals in that field are well known. Our allies and we have called for substantial and balanced reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe and we are still waiting for a NATO reply to our initiative.

Generally speaking, European affairs would make a far brisker progress if the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were examined in the West without bias and not misrepresented there as diplomatic traps and ploys. As Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has pointed out on more than one occasion, the Soviet Union does not at all believe that its security can rest on prejudice to the security interests of other countries, and we are consistently proceeding in our practical policy from this premise. Let us seek accords on the basis of common sense, political realism and the principles of peaceful coexistence with due regard for the worries and interests of every nation.

The Stockholm Conference, the success of which made a favorable impact on the Vienna meeting which opened recently, showed that Europe could advance in that direction. If the momentum of the European process is maintained in Vienna, greater security and a higher level of cooperation in every field will be achieved.

Clearly, detente cannot be confined to cooperation in any one field, even a very important one. The European process should be advanced in every area, all the more so since the condition of cooperation in any area we take is far below the real potentialities and needs of European countries. This holds true, in particular; for the economy, environmental protection, science, technology, and the safe development of atomic power enginering. We stand for more energetic cooperation in those fields and for a joint search for new ways and forms of such cooperation.

Problems of humanitarian cooperation are calling for attention and a new, comprehensive approach as well. That is why the Soviet Union has put forward at the Vienna meeting the proposal to convene in Moscow a representative conference of the CSCE states to discuss a broad range of relevant issues, including human contacts and information, cultural and educational exchanges. We believe that if such a conference is held in a constructive spirit, a new chapter of humanitarian cooperation in Europe could be opened.

In conclusion I would like to express satisfaction with today's exchanges of views with you and Foreign Minister Mr. Van Den Broek. Of course, there are substantial differences between our views. Yet we could note at the same time that our approaches to some important issues were quite compatible, offering a basis for cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Netherlands in strengthening security and broadening cooperation in Europe and in strengthening world peace. With such a prospect before us, we will always be ready to continue business contacts with the government of your country.

Permit me to wish you and all our Dutch guests the best of health and every success and the people of the Netherlands, for whom we have sincere respect, peace and prosperity.

Lubbers' Reply to Hosts

PM251145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on "Speech by R. Lubbers" (PRAVDA subhead) at 20 November Kremlin dinner for the Netherlands' prime minister under the general heading: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] We highly appreciate the invitation to make this visit and we attach great significance to the talks which have begun here.

It is also very pleasant for us to renew our acquaintance with Moscow, he said. We have been impressed by the enormous renovation effort being made.

The fact that the aim of the first mission sent from the Netherlands to Russia in 1631 was to promote trade represents a substantial and characteristic feature of our bilateral relations in the past, and this is reflected in a corresponding modern form. It is evidenced, for example, by the fact that during this visit our foreign minister and I will sign a number of agreements directly linked to cooperation between our countries in the economic and agricultural spheres. It is also evidenced by the presence here of a number of prominent representatives of the Netherlands' business circles. I would very much like to express the hope that these agreements will be a stimulus and will contribute in the future to the intensification of cooperation between the Netherlands and the USSR.

I pin similar hopes on our cultural and scientific contacts.

Having spoken in favor of the exchange of information and broader communication between people in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act, R. Lubbers continued: I do not want to miss the chance to say that the Bolshoi Theater's recent performances in our country made a great impression everywhere and without doubt it can be regarded as a high point in this year's Netherlands' cultural program.

For all the importance of bilateral relations between our countries they are not the sum total of our policy. We attach great importance to arms control, arms reduction, and nonuse of force, and we want to see not only peoples, but individuals as well developing freely. This also determines the significance the government, parliament, and public opinion in the Netherlands attach to human rights, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom of movement. The Netherlands is seeking to intensify dialogue on human rights.

The recent progress made in the military sphere at the Stockholm Conference does not give grounds for disregarding the human factor. We hope that the document adopted in Stockholm, the first in many years in the sphere of confidence and security-building measures between East and West, will generate a favorable climate for the meeting that has now begun in Vienna. We would like to think that all the participating countries will adopt a constructive approach.

Questions of limiting and reducing arms rightly occupy the central place in our talks. As for nuclear armaments, I want to stress that we attach enormous significance to the Geneva talks between the United States and the Soviet Union leading to substantial and verifiable agreements permitting a sharp reduction of nuclear arsenals. The Netherlands' prime minister expressed the hope that progress will be achieved at summit talks between Washington and Moscow. The talks in Reykjavik demonstrated, he continued, that there is a real and valid possibility of an agreement being reached which would reduce the medium-range system in Europe to zero and cut it very heavily outside Europe. Naturally, we are aware that such a step would not be viewed in isolation. At the same time, the Netherlands' prime minister objected to the linking of such an agreement to accords on strategic armaments and space.

Our government attaches the greatest importance to the speediest implementation of an all-embracing, worldwide ban on chemical weapons, R. Lubbers continued, and it was gratifying to see progress being made in that sphere in the summer, although we are aware that much remains to be done. We hope that through joint efforts in this sphere it will be possible to achieve specific results in the foreseeable future.

Certainly it is exceedingly important that we making advances in the sphere of confidence-building measures and are increasingly assuming that verification and on-site inspections are an essential instrument of arms limitation, of the reduction of tension, and positive cooperation.

The concept of reciprocal openness [otkrytost], which includes inspections, verification, and cooperation, is of great importance. It could also play a big part in the gradual limitation and reduction of nuclear weapon tests, which would lead to their cessation. Here again it is a matter of combining our efforts.

The events at Chernobyl patently demonstrated to what extent the use of new technologies in all areas is prompting the peoples to elaborate joint guidelines where security, health, people's well-being, and the protection of our environment are concerned. I will take this opportunity to express my sympathy for the Chernobyl victims and their families. It is highly gratifying to note that agreements have been reached within the IAEA framework on the need for swift notification and international aid in the event of accidents at nuclear reactors.

The guest then dwelt on regional conflicts and the world's hot spots. I am referring, he said, to the Near East, where peace has still not been reached between Israel and the neighboring countries and where a satisfactory settlement of the Palestinian people's rights has still not been found; Lebanon, which is still divided by civil war; and the conflict between Iran and Iraq, which has been going on for many years. I am also referring to the situation in South Africa, in Central America, and in Southeast Asia. I must also mention the Afghan situation, which urgently requires a political solution.

The Netherlands attaches great significance to the United Nations, which, unfortunately, has had to overcome serious financial difficulties. Profound structural solutions are required here, but first of all the UN members must unswervingly discharge their financial obligations.

Having stressed that the Netherlands is an active member of the European Community and that European unity is one of the cornerstones of the Netherlands' foreign policy, the prime minister voiced satisfaction at the resumption of contacts between the European Community and CEMA. This also applies to contacts between the EEC and individual CEMA members. We attach great significance to these contacts not only in economic, but also in political terms, R. Lubbers added.

In overcoming our ideological contradictions and differences, we must work in the spirit of Helsinki on what we can do in the interests of the citizens of Europe, he said.

There are many areas where the USSR and the Netherlands can cooperate. They include, of course, as I have already said, the economy, technology, and modernization. Agricultural labor productivity is at a very high level in the Netherlands. We are the leaders in a number of other areas. High quality is a characteristic of our products. All this is highly important. But people are most important. Every person must be given the chance to show what he is capable of, what he wants and what he can do. The human factor, the releasing of people's potential ensures real progress in the economy. Therefore we are prepared to go further than simply maintaining trade relations. We are seeking to create so-called joint enterprises to enable our countries' citizens to really cooperate with one another. People's efforts and cooperation with as few formalities as possible could produce considerable results. A great deal could be achieved through the activation of the human factor. We must strive for this, and the plans we manage to carry out will have a favorable impact on other spheres. Let this be the aim of our economic cooperation.

In conclusion, R. Lubbers said: In the modern world sincere dialogue is needed, together with a wish to understand one another. It is in this light that we also view our visit to Moscow. We hope that our conversations will contribute to better cooperation.

The Netherlands' Government head proposed a toast to the USSR Council of Ministers' chairman, to the well-being of all Soviet people, and to the successful development of relations between the Netherlands and the USSR.

The speeches by N.I. Ryzhkov and R. Lubbers were listened to closely and were applauded.

The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Urges Jewish Emigration

LD211219 Hilversum International Service in English 1130 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers and Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek will meet today with Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on the 2d day of their visit to Moscow. The main points on the agenda include an improvement in mutual trade relations and American-Soviet arms control talks.

Speaking at a dinner in his honor at the invitation of his Soviet opposite, Nikolay Ryzhkov, Mr Lubbers urged the Soviets to reach a speedy separate agreement on the elimination of all intermediate-range missiles in Europe. The Soviets are expected to continue to insist that such accords be linked to an agreement on the American space based defense system, SDI.

In his dinner the Dutch prime minister also appealed to the Soviet Union to practice a more lenient policy on the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. Mr Lubbers had promised the then Israeli prime minister, Shim'on Peres when he visited the Netherlands several months ago to make this request. The Communist Party news paper PRAVDA has not published Prime Minister Lubbers' comments regarding Jewish emigration. However, the contents of the rest of his speech were reported.

'Frank' Talks With Gorbachev

PM241547 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1-2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Talks With Netherlands Prime Minister R. Lubbers" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] On 21 November M.S. Gorbachev met in the Kremlin with Rudolph Lubbers, prime minister of the Netherlands. The sides had frank, friendly and informal talks, which at times were interspersed with lively discussions, on very topical problems.

They drew general conclusions from the results of the talks the Dutch prime minister and his colleagues had in Moscow in the past few days and voiced their shared interest in the development of bilateral relations across the spectrum, including trade, technology exchanges and cooperation in industry, agriculture, culture and human contacts. Let us give it a try, Mikhail Gorbachev said in this regard. He informed the other side in detail of the character of the socioeconomic and democratic processes currently unfolding in the Soviet Union. They are stemming from great plans, which enjoy the enthusiastic support of the people.

These processes have their difficulties but we are confident that we will carry through our plans. This will have a tremendous impact on the country and on the world as a whole. Our plans show that the Soviet Union has an interest in a normal international situation, civilized relations between states and genuine peaceful coexistence.

Rudolph Lubbers said that his country wished success to the new plans that had been made and were being fulfilled in the Soviet Union because they would help, inter alia, raise Soviet-Dutch relations to a new level and make it possible "to cancel mistrust."

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the Soviet Union would like its policy to be fully predictable to the Netherlands. The sides agreed that new life should be breathed into relations between the two countries and that they should be filled with practical content in the spirit of Helsinki and with due regard for the specific interests and priorities of each of them.

The sides attached priority attention in the talks to the international situation since the Reykjavik meeting.

Mikhail Gorbachev made a reminder of the disarmament initiatives and proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in the recent period, proposals that more than took account of the real worries of the West European countries on every position, from nuclear to conventional arms.

The Budapest initiative of the Warsaw Treaty countries was also a manifestation of sensitivity to the West European worries. However, there has been no reply to it for half a year now, just as there has been no reaction to the proposal that the working groups of the two military alliances meet to begin work on the question of reductions in conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe. Neither did we meet with understanding when we posed a way out of the deadlock at the 13-year-old Vienna talks.

Rudolph Lubbers and Hans van den Broek agreed that the Soviet Union had no intention of "attacking" Western Europe but nevertheless failed to explain why NATO was clinging so stubbornly to positions that actually amounted to support for a policy of the arms race. They declined to explain, too, why the U.S. President had again called for a "crusade" against the Soviet Union just one month after the Reykjavik meeting.

The position of the West European NATO members since Reykjavik makes one wonder if they really have an interest in ridding Europe of nuclear weapons and drastically lowering the level of armed confrontation on the continent.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave a principled appraisal of the conduct of the U.S. Administration, which would like to mix up and misrepresent everything that had been achieved in Reykjavik, and in pulling backwards.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet leadership would firmly adhere to the positions reached in Reykjavik and noted that working on its initiatives and proposals, the Soviet Union, as before, would strictly take account of the real interests and concerns of its partners. Otherwise there can be no progress to security that is acceptable to all. We are constantly watching it. Any attempt to outwit anyone and to put one's partner into an inferior position will fail. This is how we will advance on the road opened by Reykjavik to the beginning of real arms reductions.

Addressing the Dutch prime minister and through him the other NATO governments, Mikhail Gorbachev invited them anew to thoroughly think over everything that had happened in Reykjavik. It was not an ordinary event. We had been going for 10 years to such a rapprochement of our positions which had seemed unbelievable quite recently. [sentence as received]

The package of our major proposals is complex of concessions and interests. The striving to tear out of this package one thing here and another there can upset the balance and violate the principle of mutual security.

Mikhail Gorbachev explained in detail why the Soviet Union was dead set against the SDI program. He noted, inter alia, that the belief that SDI would make America more secure was an illusion. The very opposite will happen. Since this program is fraught with a fundamentally new, unpredictable round of the arms race and is intended to achieve military-strategic superiority, we have to counter it and we have already thought out this matter.

The intentions being cherished to exhaust the USSR with the arms race spring from bad delusions about its potentialities, from misunderstanding of the unbreakable links between the Soviet leadership and the people, from unwillingness to reckon with the mighty patriotic will of the Soviet people.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Rudolph Lubbers agreed that now is the right time really to achieve accords on actual arms cuts and on halting the arms race. But this chance can be missed.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Rudolph Lubbers expressed their satisfaction with the talks, which set the stage for meaningful dialogue. Their arguments have become clear to each other. They agreed to continue dialogue and advance a search for solutions to urgent problems of common importance.

As the sides were parting, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet people knew that the Dutch had no ill designs against our country. With all the differences of their views and convictions, they can effectively cooperate to the good of their own interests and those of Europe as a whole.

Eduard Shevardnadze, Dutch foreign minister Hans van den Broek and the ambassadors of the two countries, A.I. Blatov and Petus Buwalda, took part in the talks.

Meets Ryzhkov, Protocol Signed

PM250945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

["Soviet-Dutch Talks" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] On 21 November talks between N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Dutch Prime Minister R. Lubbers came to a close in the Kremlin.

Participating in the talks were: N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers state foreign economic commission; B.I. Aristov, USSR foreign trade minister; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; A.I. Blatov, USSR ambassador to the Netherlands; [paragraph continues]

and N.N. Afanasyevskiy, chief of the first European section of the USSR ministry of foreign affairs, on the Soviet side; H. van den Broek, foreign minister; P. Buwalda, Dutch ambassador to the USSR; H. Wijnagedts, foreign ministry general director for political affairs, F.A. Engering, general director of foreign economic relations at the ministry of economic affairs; J.P.M.H. Merkelbach, adviser to the prime minister; M.J.D. van der Voet, chief director of the government information service; J.J. Groeneveld, director of agricultural produce processing and sales at the ministry of agriculture and fisheries, A.J. Ettema, director of the Atlantic cooperation and international security department at the foreign ministry, and other officials on the Dutch side.

The sides continued to discuss in the practical plane a broad range of questions of bilateral relations and international problems. Summing up the packed talks, the two heads of government were unanimous that today it was more important than ever before intensively to conduct a dialogue between European countries both at international forums and through bilateral channels. The sides expressed their shared desire for more intensive exchanges of views between the USSR and the Netherlands to broaden areas of political understanding, primarily with regard to curbing the arms race. The sides displayed different approaches to some international problems, especially those related to disarmament.

Both sides noted the importance of Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Rudolf Lubbers and Hans van den Broek to the further development of Soviet-Dutch relations, especially in the political field.

The talks passed in a frank and well-intentioned atmosphere, in the spirit of a concerned search for ways of better understanding each other's positions. Their results are called upon to help identify new areas of bilateral contacts and cooperation.

Soviet-Dutch documents were signed in the Kremlin.

Nikolay Ryzhkov and Rudolf Lubbers signed a long-term program for the development of economic, industrial and technological cooperation between the USSR and the Netherlands, and also a long-term program for the development of cooperation in the agro-industry with the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Netherlands.

A protocol to the agreement between the USSR and the Netherlands on the development of economic, industrial and technological cooperation of July 15, 1975 was signed by Soviet foreign trade minister Boris Aristov and Hans van den Broek.

Soviet Finance Minister Boris Gostev and Hans van den Broek signed a convention to avoid double taxation between the governments of the USSR and the Netherlands.

On the same day, Vladimir Kamentsev, a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Boris Aristov had talks with Rudolf Lubbers. The sides reviewed a broad range of issues related to the condition of and economic cooperation between Soviet and Dutch organizations and companies.

Dutch businessmen who had arrived in the USSR in connection with Rudolf Lubbers' visit took part in the talks.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS ARRIVAL OF BENIN'S KEREKOU

PM250859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] Mathieu Kerekou, chairman of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin Central Committee and president and head of government of the People's Republic of Benin, arrived in Moscow 21 November on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government.

The leader of Benin was welcomed at the aircraft steps at Vnukovo Airport by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The welcoming ceremony was attended by S.B. Tatliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; USSR Minister G.A. Yagodin; K.F. Katushev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; G.M. Korniyenko, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section; P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister; A.Yu. Urnov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, V.V. Pavlov, USSR ambassador to the People's Republic of Benin; and other officials.

The welcoming party also included I.I. Laleye, ambassador of the People's Republic of Benin to the USSR; heads of diplomatic missions from a number of African countries accredited to the USSR; and Beninese students studying in Moscow VUZ's.

The state flags of the Soviet Union and Benin were raised at the airport, and an honor guard from the three branches of the USSR Armed Forces -- Ground Forces, Air Force, and Navy -- was formed on the tarmac. The orchestra played the two countries' national anthems.

A.A. Gromyko and M. Kerekou reviewed the formation of Soviet servicemen.

The welcoming ceremony concluded with a march-past by the honor guard.

The state flags of Benin and the USSR and banners with welcoming messages decorated the streets and squares through which the motorcade and its honorary motorcycle escort traveled on the way from the airport to the residence.

Received by Gorbachev

PM241209 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

[M.S. Gorbachev's Talks With M. Kerekou" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has met 21 November with Mathieu Kerekou, chairman of the Central Committee of the People's Revolution of Benin Party (PRPB), president and head of government of the People's Republic of Benin.

In the course of the comradely conversation, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke about the active, purposeful work for implementing the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU, carrying out the policy of all-round accelerated development of the Soviet society, which enables the fullest use of the advantages of socialism for the benefit of the Soviet people, the cause of peace all over the world.

Mathieu Kerekou spoke about the efforts by the Benin people and the PRPB, their vanguard party, aimed at strengthening political independence and carrying out progressive socio-economic reforms. He expressed gratitude for the Soviet Union's aid and support to the people of Benin in national construction.

The leaders of the two countries expressed satisfaction with the state of the friendly Soviet-Benin relations and pointed out that there are favorable prospects for their futher fruitful and mutually-beneficial development in various fields.

In discussing the key problems of the present-day international situation, serious concern was expressed over the world tensions remaining through imperialism's fault. Mathieu Kerekou said that the people of Benin had received with approval the Soviet Union's constructive stand at the Reykjavik meeting. The implementation of the peaceable Soviet initiatives, he stressed, would make it possible to create a comprehensive international security system, to eliminate nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons, to achieve a qualitatively new situation in the world.

Mikhail Gorbachev positively evaluated the contribution made by the African and other developing countries to the struggle for improving the international situation, which particularly clearly manifested itself in the decisions of the non-aligned forum in Harare. He pointed out that putting an end to the weapons race would release considerable funds for development aims and eliminating backwardness.

The sides resolutely condemned the racist South African regime and its imperialist patrons, reaffirmed their solidarity with the "frontline" states, with the embattled peoples of South Africa and Namibia.

Mathieu Kerekou invited Mikhail Gorbachev to visit the People's Republic of Benin. The invitation was received with gratitude. The time of the visit is to be agreed upon through diplomatic channels at a later date.

The meeting proceeded in a friendly atmosphere characteristic of the relations between the two parties and countries.

Arrives in Azerbaijan 22 Nov

LD221726 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1549 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Baku, 22 Nov (TASS) -- Mathieu Kerekou, chairman of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin Central Committee and president and head of government of the People's Republic of Benin, arrived today from Moscow in Baku, capital of the Soviet Transcaucasian Republic of Azerbaijan. He is in the Soviet Union on an official, friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government. On the same day Mathieu Kerekou had a conversation at the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee with Kyamran Bagirov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee.

PRAVDA REPORTS 20 NOVEMBER POLITBURO SESSION

PM241529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] At its 20 November session, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed the results of the conference on questions of the introduction of the State Acceptance of Production in associations and at enterprises of industrial ministries, which was held at the CPSU Central Committee. As pointed out at the session, raising the quality of production is an inalienable, integral part of the strategy of acceleration and of the party's course toward the fundamental restructuring of the national economy and raising the welfare of the Soviet people.

Heads of ministries and departments, of the State Standards Committee, of associations and enterprises and trade unions are urged to step up preparatory work on introducing State Acceptance of Production as of January 1987. The Politburo noted that this work must be closely coordinated with the transition of enterprises and associations to the principles of full financial autonomy, self-financing and self-recouping, and raising their independence and responsibility.

It was emphasized that the Central Committees of the union republic communist parties, kraykoms and obkoms of the party are urged to ensure a high level of selection and deployment of cadres for State Acceptance and to step up educational work in labor collectives to explain the objectives and the tasks of the State Acceptance, and to strive for comprehensive strengthening of order and discipline, a decisive factor in improving the quality of production.

Having listened to a report on the work of Perm Obkom, the Politburo noted that the oblast party organization is still weakly and imcompletely implementing the favorable opportunities that have opened up since the 27th CPSU Congress for profound qualitative changes in economic and social life. The obkom is only slowly translating the party's general directives on to a channel of practical action and is doing little to ensure that the congress' instructions, its high moral and spiritual tone, sense of principle and exactingness gain a firm hold in each party committee and in each primary party organization.

The party committees of the oblast have not drawn the proper lessons from the fact that in recent years the economy and the social sphere have been developing at a slow rate, and have not fully exposed the reasons for instances of stagnation. The key problems of the activation of the human factor and a more effective use of the powerful production and scientific potential that has been created in Perm Oblast are being lost sight of.

The work of party, local soviet and economic bodies, public organizations and labor collectives is still being poorly oriented toward searching for and bringing into play reserves for a growth in labor productivity, raising the quality of production and intensifying the economy regime. The condition of state planning discipline is not being improved at many enterprises.

It is pointed out in a decision that was adopted that the serious shortcomings in the development of the economy and the social sphere are, first and foremost, a consequence of the fact that there have been no substantial changes in the style of work of the obkom and its bureau. Its attitude to people and to everyday matters is still weak and there is an entrenched habit of bypassing acute questions and being satisfied with average results.

Party committees often usurp the functions of local soviet, trade union and economic bodies, thus holding up their restructuring and the development of initiative and spontaneous action.

As before, cadre questions are being tackled without the required sense of principle and consistency.

The Politburo drew the attention of the Perm Obkom, its bureau, and of the obkom First Secretary Comrade Konoplev to serious omissions in its work, to sluggishness and inconsistency in the restructuring of the activity of party, soviet, economic bodies, of primary party organizations and labor collectives of the oblast. It was proposed that the obkom deeply and self-critically analyze the content and methods of its activity, and also the work of local party bodies during the post-congress period, and undertake specific steps to remove the shortcomings.

It was stressed that party committees everywhere should create a situation of creative and interested participation, with incentives, of communists and of all working people in the struggle for acceleration, should more actively undertake restructuring from above and below, ensure widespread openness, develop to the utmost criticism and self-criticism, and strive for the unity of word and deed.

A resolution [postanovleniye] of the CPSU Central Committee and of the USSR Council of Ministers on improving the organization of the reconstruction and major overhaul of housing and social and cultural facilities in the Russian Federation was endorsed. It envisions the conduct of an integral technological policy in this sphere and the implementation of the relevant work under contractual agreements being entrusted to the RSFSR Ministry of Housing and Civil Construction. It is intended to increase significantly by the year 1990 the volume of the major overhaul of housing and also to expand substantially their reconstruction and modernization.

The results of the talks between a CPSU delegation and one from the Social Democratic Party of Finland, and of the meeting between Comrade Ligachev and Finnish President Koivisto, were considered at the Politburo session. It was stressed that the Soviet Union ascribes paramount significance to the strengthening of the relationship of friendship and cooperation with neighboring Finland by all means. The certainty was expressed that the long years of experience, the mutual trust of the Soviet and Finnish peoples, and the congruence of their long-term interests make it possible to raise the relations of our countries to a still higher level and affirm once again the prospects that exist in the policy of peaceful coexistence and detente.

It was noted with satisfaction that the new steps by the Soviet Union aimed at strengthening security in the region of northern Europe, which were discussed at Helsinki, and the initiatives connected with turning this region into a nuclear-free zone are meeting with a positive international response.

A report by Comrade Aliyev was heard on the participation of a CPSU Delegation in the work of the Fourth Congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party and on the conversations between the delegation and Comrade Phomvihan and other Lao leaders. The resolve was affirmed to continue to strengthen the friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the CPSU and the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, between the Soviet Union and the Lao People's Democratic Republic on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, to do everything necessary to deepen the fraternal friendship of the peoples of our countries.

Some other issues of the development of the Soviet economy, cadre policy, and the realization of the foreign policy course of our country were also discussed at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE CRITICIZES PLAN FULFILLMENT

LD222232 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The issue of the course of fulfillment of the national economic plan for social and cultural construction in 1986 has been considered in the CPSU Central Committee.

The decision the CPSU Central Committee adopted stresses that the successful implementation of the program for housing and social amenities construction is a crucial condition for the steady improvement of the labor and political activity of Soviet people.

It was commented that many ministries, departments and soviets of people's deputies have not ensured the necessary restructuring in their activity in this direction, have not attained a fundamental improvement in the construction of amenities in the social and cultural complex and, as previously, regard this as a matter of secondary importance. The construction of housing, stores, hospitals, professional and vocational colleges, higher educational establishments, clubs, and sporting facilities is being conducted unsatisfactorily manner and is lagging behind the plan tasks.

The Central Committee has demanded of the relevant organizations that they take exhaustive steps with respect to the unconditional fulfillment of the plan established for the present year on the introduction of amenities for the whole social complex and across the whole range.

An account of the decision will be published in the press.

Looks at Construction Progress

LD221415 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has examined the progress of the fulfillment of the national economy plan for social and cultural construction in 1986. It was noted that more attention is now being given to the development of the social sphere, housing construction, and cultural and everyday amenities. Over the last 10 months of the current year, the commissioning of housing has increased, all in all, around the country by 14 percent compared with the same period last year; the commissioning of schools, by 13 percent; children's preschool facilities, by 27 percent; hospitals and polyclinics, by 60 percent. Yet many ministries departments and Soviets of People's Deputies have not ensured the necessary restructuring of their activities in this direction.

A resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee has stressed that the successful implementation of the program for the construction of housing and everyday public amenities is the decisive condition for the undeviating growth of the level of labor and political activity of the Soviet people, the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, and the further growth of people's prosperity.

OFFICIAL DESCRIBES STATE ACCEPTANCE SERVICE

LD210041 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Nov 86

[Program entitled "The State Acceptance Service: A Struggle for Quality"; interview with Igor Ivanovich Isayev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Standards by commentator I.N. Zhukov -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zhukov] Igor Ivanovich, what does the State Acceptance body at the enterprise comprise? It is the first and the basic link of the whole system.

[Isayev] The State Acceptance body is being set up at enterprises and associations and is a nondepartmental state control body. It exists permanently at a plant or a factory, monitors the manufacture of output, monitors the work of the technical control department, and, after acceptance of the output by the technical control department, it conducts the acceptance of the finished output of the enterprise. To all intents and purposes the State Acceptance Service -- its head or a representative of the State Acceptance Service -- signs the documentation for the dispatch of the output, which permits it to be marketed. [passage omitted]

[Zhukov] Excuse me, Igor Ivanovich, but how many specialists will be carrying out this work?

[Isayev] The number of people working in the State Acceptance body at the plant will not be so very great. It will be about one-tenth of the number of people engaged in the technical control department. [passage omitted] If it is individual production, the production of single products, each product will of course need to be accepted. If it is mass production, statistical methods of monitoring will be employed. Therefore it is sufficient to have a small staff as regards numbers in order to encompass the state monitoring of the output that is to be produced by the enterprise. At the average machine-building enterprise the numbers of the State Acceptance Service amount to 10-15 persons. The enterprise itself must make provision for the work of the State Acceptance Service. [passage omitted]

[Zhukov] Igor Ivanovich, I would like to ask you to tell us what the powers of the State Acceptance Service will be at the industrial enterprise?

[Isayev] If it is found that the products do not correspond with the requirements of the valid documentation on technical standards, the State Acceptance body must prohibit the dispatch of the output. It must stop it being marketed, and the output must be returned as defective, even though it was accepted by the technical control department. The defective products must be returned to be put right or else to be destroyed, if the defect cannot be put right. [passage omitted]

[Zhukov] Igor Ivanovich, what will the organizational structure of the State Acceptance Service on the nationwide scale be like?

[Isayev] Well, the government has approved a list of 1,500 associations and enterprises. On this list are the enterprises that produce the most important national-economic products, consumer goods and the main parts and materials for them -- for these goods and these products for technical production purpose. On the basis of this list the 1,500 existing enterprises are being divided into two groups, as it were. The first group comprises those who are producing end products -- namely, tractors, refrigerators, all the televisions.

[Zhukov interrupts] Motor Vehicles, obviously.

[Isayev] Yes, motor vehicles. We have, for example, covered 94 percent of goods vehicles. This percentage of all the goods vehicles being produced in the country comes under the State Acceptance Service. It covers virtually all agricultural tractors and all fodder-harvesting and grain-harvesting combines. That is to say, there is a very high coverage of complex end products. Then there has been an analysis of the entire chain and all the links with associated enterprises. We included in this list those enterprises that produce the main parts for these goods. [passage omitted]

[Zhukov] Igor Ivanovich, how then will this complex system be managed?

[Isayev] The 1,500 heads of the State Acceptance bodies have been included by us in the list of names appointees of the USSR State Committee for standards, and have been approved by the collegium.

[Zhukov] So they are staff-members of your committee?

[Isayev] There are staff-members of our committee and belong to our highest list of named appointees. I may say in passing that they have been included too in the list of named appointees of local party bodies. That is to say that there is very attention and these posts are at a very high level as regards, so to speak, the attitude toward them by all administrative organs. The 1,500 heads are to come under the main State Acceptance directorate of the USSR State Committee for Standards. [passage omitted]

The fact that 1,500 enterprises come under the control of the State Acceptance service means that a very great load is put on our system. First, 1,500 enterprises are released in full from all types of other control. All possible kinds of interdepartmental inspection, such as the inspection of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, the inspection of the Ministry of the Railways and so on, which were accepted on behalf of customers, disappear there, are eliminated. Apart from that, the whole of the state supervision [gosnadzor] is now carried out at these enterprises by the forces of this State Acceptance service; that is, our inspectors from the territorial bodies, who live in the same town and who have great experience in checking -- selective checking -- the quality of output and the state of observance of standards at these enterprises, do not even go to these enterprises. Therefore, the forces of state supervision [gosnadzora] are partially freed, disengaged, in order to occupy themselves with other enterprises in the same region. Apart from that, it falls as a duty on these territorial bodies of state supervision at the first signal of a representative of the State Acceptance service to undertake urgent and effective measures with regard to deliveries of components, raw materials and materials from works that are located on territory within the jurisdiction of this territorial body. [passage omitted] These territorial bodies have the influence to correct bad work. This is an utterly new style, an utterly new tempo and a new quality from the viewpoint of the efficiency of response. [passage omitted]

At the conference in the Central Committee Comrade Kurshov, who is our leader for the State Acceptance service at Kamaz, quoted a figure to the effect that analysis now shows that of the 463 works that deliver components to Kamaz, 39 produce components that do not conform to standards. Thus our territorial bodies will come down on these 39.

[Zhukov] I see. Igor Ivanovich, as you said, starting with the new year 1,500 enterprises will be working with the State Acceptance service. The State Acceptance service will be functioning actively at these enterprises. How, on what principles, did the selection of leading cadres for this work take place?

[Isayev] Of course a great deal depends on the cadres, and there was a great deal of talk about this at the conference in the party's Central Committee. [passage omitted] But there was also another situation: Directors stubbornly recommended to us and thrust upon us simply unprincipled people, simply people they wanted and... [changes thought] Irresponsible. With whom will it be easier? Who is convenient for the director? Of course we rejected such proposals and we were guided first and foremost by the recommendation of the oblast committee or the Central Committee of the Union Republic.

[Zhukov] The State Acceptance service is at this moment already working at a whole series of enterprises of industrial ministries. What difficulties did you come up against the first instance in this work?

[Isayev] Well, first and foremost, the position with regard to discipline, performance discipline, technological discipline. Many technological operations which are written down in a document are not carried out. Many tests are not conducted, or their volumes are so reduced that all of this exists simply for abuse and for their own convenience.

[Zhukov] That is, they carelessly churn out products?

[Isayev] They carelessly churn out products, and there were even cases where our State Acceptance service found that operations had increased the speed of the conveyor, higher than the calculated, designed speed. So that it was impossible to make a component in the intervening time. [passage omitted]

PARLIAMENTARY GROUP HOLDS 19 NOVEMBER MEETING

PM231350 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "General Meeting of USSR Parliamentary Group"]

[Text] A general meeting of the USSR Parliamentary Group, of which all the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies are members, was held in the Kremlin 19 November under L.N. Tolkunov's chairmanship.

The meeting examined questions connected with involvement in the work of the IPU, made changes to the "Statute on the USSR Parliamentary Group," and elected USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy A.S. Yeliseyev deputy chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group and Deputy I.D. Laptev secretary of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

Sessions of a number of sections of the USSR Parliamentary Group were held the same day.

MASLENNIKOV ON PLAN, BUDGET AT SUPREME SOVIET

PM211421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 2, 3

["Coreport of the Soviet of Nationalities Budget and Planning and Other Standing Commissions delivered by Deputy N.I. Maslennikov, keynote speaker and chairman of the Budget and Planning Commission," delivered at the 17 November Evening Session of the Soviet of Nationalities in the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers' Hall of Sessions"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Deputies! The present USSR Supreme Soviet session is taking place in a period of abrupt change in the country's life and of major creative transformations affecting all spheres of our society.

The large-scale plans for restructuring, put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress, are indissolubly linked with the active foreign policy aimed at consolidating peace and all-around international cooperation. The Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik was a most important event in the struggle against the arms race and for banning and eliminating nuclear weapons and diverting the threat of war from mankind. Our people fully approve the stance taken by M.S. Gorbachev, which combines firm principles with constructiveness in the search for the necessary solutions.

Supporting the party's policy, working people are struggling persistently to implement it. The preliminary results of the first year of the 12th 5-Year Plan demonstrate a higher rate of development than last year in virtually all sectors of the national economy. Gas extraction workers are coping with their targets, oil workers are eliminating their backlog, and the mining industry, ferrous metallurgy, and transport are working successfully. An improvement has been achieved in the agro-industrial complex. A substantial increase in agricultural output has been achieved in many regions by the skillful use of intensive techniques and progressive forms of labor organization. The development of the social complex has been accelerated. Thus, it is abundantly clear that the situation in the country is improving. What is particularly important is that long-term strategic growth factors have begun to take effect.

At the same time, as the party Central Committee points out, the burden of shortcomings and omissions which accumulated in the past is continuing to take its toll. In a number of sectors restructuring has not been properly launched, is not being conducted effectively enough, and has not extended to all labor collectives. Thus, the main task at present is to consolidate the positive changes which have occurred and to achieve greater dynamism in socioeconomic development.

On the instructions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Soviet of Nationalities standing commissions, in conjunction with Soviet of the Union standing commissions, carried out a preliminary examination of the country's 1987 plan and budget, analyzed progress in the fulfillment of this year's plan and the execution of the 1985 budget, and drew up the conclusions now before you, Comrade Deputies.

The rates of economic development established by the 5-year plan are retained in the 1987 targets. National income will rise by 4.1 percent and industrial output will rise by 4.4 percent. The process of intensifying social production will be stepped up, which will make it possible to accelerate labor productivity growth and deepen the qualitative changes in the national economy. The improved balance of the plan targets is to be achieved mainly by more rational use of all types of resources and by tightening up the thrift policy.

The introduction of progressive forms and methods of economic leadership is being expanded. Next year, all of industry, the agro-industrial complex, transport and communications, and consumer services will be working under the new economic management conditions. The fundamental restructuring of the economic mechanism has begun in construction and trade. Such effective levers as autonomous financing and self-capitalization are being actively adopted. New principles are being built into the system of managing foreign economic activity.

The plan includes high social guidelines for improving the quality and raising the standard of the people's life. The targets for the construction of housing and other projects in the sociocultural sphere exceed the 5-year plan indicators for this year. Housing conditions will improve for approximately 10 million people. Work to renew the entire public education system will continue. Consumer goods production and the volume of the population's paid services will increase in line with the Comprehensive Program targets.

The progressive development of the economy and culture of all union republics and the fuller mobilization of their potential in the interests of strengthening the country's integrated national economic complex are envisaged. The regions' natural wealth, manpower, and other resources will be used more rationally. Special significance is attached to the Siberia and Far East regions.

It should be noted that a significant feature of the formation of the 1987 plan is the resolute abandonment of the former system of planning based on achieved levels. This creates the conditions for discovering additional potential for growth and encourages labor collectives to conduct a creative search, to show initiative, and to adopt counterplans and socialist pledges.

The commissions found potential for increasing the production and sale of consumer goods by a total of R217.8 million in retail prices and propose that the plan be ratified to take account of these amendments.

The 1987 State Budget provides the necessary financial resources to meet the measures outlined by the plan to accelerate the rates of economic and social development, improve the Soviet people's well-being, and strengthen the country's defense might. It incorporates union republic budgets totaling R193,788,000,000.

The commissions propose that budget revenue be increased by R150 million in the light of the amendments to the State Plan.

After examining the proposals of union republic councils of ministers and USSR ministries and departments, the commissions believe that the extra revenue thus found will make it possible to increase budget spending by R70 million on public service provision in cities, workers settlements, and rural rayon centers, R25 million on the capital repair of health care institution buildings, R30 million on the capital repair of cultural and educational institution buildings, and R25 million on the acquisition of equipment and stock by settlement and rural soviets.

It is proposed to allocate these appropriations to union republic budgets in the following amounts:

	(in thousands of rubles)
RSFSR	81,270
Ukraine SSR	26,640
Belorussian SSR	4,360
Uzbek SSR	6,190
Kazakh SSR	7,730
Georgian SSR	4,270
Azerbaijan SSR	3,910
Lithuanian SSR	2,610
Moldavian SSR	2,330
Latvian SSR	2,080
Kirghizia SSR	1,480
Tajik SSR	2,030
Armenian SSR	2,340
Turkmen SSR	1,580
Estonian SSR	1,180

In the light of the above amendments it is proposed to ratify the 1987 USSR State Budget for revenue totaling R435,682,514,000 and for expenditure totaling R435,509,914,000, with revenue exceeding expenditure by R172,600,000.

The commissions have also examined the report on the execution of the 1985 USSR State Budget and propose that it be ratified on the basis of the amounts set by the USSR Government.

Comrade Deputies! The commissions' comprehensive analysis of the 1987 targets and of the implementation of previously adopted recommendations brought to light a number of most urgent questions to which particular prominence should be given when the plan targets are conveyed to labor collectives and, most important of all, in the process of fulfilling the plan. The commissions placed main emphasis on removing the obstacles hindering socioeconomic development and slowing down the restructuring process.

Paramount attention is attached to assessing the effectiveness of the measures outlined in the plan aimed at accelerating scientific and technical progress and increasing science's influence on the national economic and results. Deputies have noted the urgent need for order to be instilled in sectoral science as soon as possible. For example, development and comissioning take a long time at a number of scientific research organizations of the USSR Ministry of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, and the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, and this produces unjustifiably large amounts of unfinished work.

At the same time, much completed research does not meet modern requirements and sometimes has absolutely no scientific or practical value whatever. At the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry's Lakokraspokrytiye science-and-production association, for example, only 1 out of 23 pieces of work was deemed new in principle and without foreign equivalents. Ant this is with regard to output for which many sectors of the national economy have an acute need. Unfortunately, a similar situation can be seen in some scientific research and planning organizations of the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Grain Prodcuts, and a number of other ministries. I should particularly like to draw attention to the kind of negative phenomenon that occurs when the increase in prime cost accompanying an improvement in the technical standard of machinery or equipment under development is so high as simply to nullify the saving from introducing them into production.

Full use is not being made of economic incentives to increase the productivity of scientists' and designers' work. For example, are fundamental improvements really to be expected in the work of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry's Institute of Mineral Fuels and its State Planning, Design, and Experimental Institute of Coal Machinery Manufacture, or the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production's All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Chemical Plant Protection Agents, when the introduction of new pay conditions there has increased workers' wages by just R1-2?

The work now begun to step up scientific and technical progress must be directed toward substantially increasing the production of the latest equipment and improving its quality. As deputies have noted, delay in the machine building complex, the key link in the retooling of the national economy, is particularly unacceptable. Many of this complex' associations and enterprises have not been fulfilling the output production plans according to the set itemized list or for sales when supply commitments are taken into account. At a number of minstries output renewal is planned at a much lower rate than in maching building as a whole. [paragraph continues]

The proportion of automated equipment involving microprocessors planned by the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Feed Production, the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, and the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building is low. The USSR Council of Ministers Machine Building Bureau is still not taking a sufficiently active stance on resolving this question.

There is grave alarm at the fact that moe than one-half of the associations and enterprises checked by the USSR State Committee for Standards are continuing to produce goods that deviate from standards and technical conditions.

The state reception of output must present a firm barrier to the production of substandard equipment. As deputies and ministry leaders have noted, however, the preparations for this have not been made everywhere. Examples have been cited of whole consignments of current products being rejected after the introduction of this system. The commissions have stressed that an effective campaign must be mounted to ensure the high standard of Soviet output and that this campaign must be uncompromising, persistent, and comprehensive.

I should like to point out that in the 1987 plan the extraction and production of fuel and energy resources are set at the level of the 5-year plan targets. However, in view, of the changes in the structure of electricity generation, measures have been outlined to increase the extraction of coal, oil, and gas above the plan. Despite that, the energy supply situation is under strain in some parts of the country.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that many enterprises are exceeding the set electricity consumption norms for output production and operational needs. This applies mainly to the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry. The introduction of energy-saving equipment and techniques is proceeding slowly. There are great shortcomings in norm-setting itself. Hence the conclusion that the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex, ministries, and departments must fundamentally reorganize work in the sphere of power supplies and ensure a strict saving of fuel and energy in all areas of the national economy.

Other omissions have also been mentioned. The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification's attention has been drawn to the need to reduce power losses in the electricity networks and the specific consumption of fuel and to ensure that targets are met. It is necessary to improve the use of casing-head petroleum gas and to reduce the wastage of natural gas during transportation. The USSR Ministry of the Gas Industry and the corresponding republic and local organs must resolutely change the situation in which only one-tenth of the heat from waste gas at compressor stations is used.

The construction complex plays an exceptionally great role in the fulfillment of the tasks of renewing fixed assets. Important steps are currently being taken to improve management in this sphere and to step up centralized leadership while at the same time expanding the rights and increasing the responsibility of union republics and local soviets for ensuring the capital construction plans. This creates favorable conditions for ensuring considerably quicker, more economical, and higher-quality work.

The sessions have noted, however, that many ministries are displaying inertia over resolving the fundamental problems of construction and are continuing to work in the old ways. Not enough construction projects are being temporarily halted to take account of the transfer to normative construction periods. [paragraph continues]

Around one-half of ministries and departments have not submitted proposals for narrowing down the construction work front. Outdated plans are being reviewed extremely slowly. This work has clearly been delayed at the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and the USSR Ministry of Power Machine Building. In the deputies' opinions, the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy and the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry claimed quite unjustifiably that the technical level of a certain number of projects developed 10-20 years ago meets modern requirements.

The USSR Gosstroy, the USSR Gosplan, USSR ministries and departments, and union republic councils of ministers are instructed to ensure that manpower and resources are concentrated on construction projects nearing completion, not to allow the use of obsolete plans, and to be more vigorous in introducing the collective contract and the own-resources method of working.

The commissions have demanded that USSR ministries and departments and republic organs strive to achieve a fundamental breakthrough in the construction of facilities forming part of the social infrastructure. It is intolerable that this year many union republics are failing to fulfill the targets for commissioning apartment blocks and preschool institutions. The construction of near-complete general education and vocational and technical schools in the RSFSR, Uzbekistan, and Kirghizia had not been finished by the beginning of the school year. Despite the acute need for maternity homes, children's hospitals, and other health care facilities, construction is not proceeding satisfactorily.

The plan attaches great significance to the implementation of the Food Program. The organizational, economic, and social factors in the development of agro-industrial production are to be used in full next year. The role and responsibility of republic and local soviet organs for organizing and improving the population's supply of food products are being enhanced.

I should like to dwell in particular on questions of the population's supplies of fruit and vegetable products. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in many union republics are not doing enough to improve the supply by using their potential for increasing the sale of potatoes, fruit, and vegetables to consumer cooperative organizations and markets. This produce comprises a mere 1-2 percent of the total volume of state purchases. The manufacture of potato products and quick-frozen vegetables and fruit is lagging considerably behind the Food Program targets. The question of increasing the range of canned products, especially those for children, is being resolved extremely poorly. The demand for children's canned fruit and vegetables is less than 50-percent satisfied and the demand for canned vegetables is less than one-third satisfied. These and other examples show that a good many problems have built up in the fruit and vegetable industry -- that is why the USSR State Agro-industrial Committee [Gosagroprom] and union republic councils of ministers must take effective measures to resolve them.

In recent years there has been a steady increase in the output of livestock products. To consolidate what has been achieved, accelerated development of the feed base must be ensured. On no account must there be any slackening of effort here or loss of the momentum that has been achieved. However, only seven union republics have fulfilled this year's feed procurement plan. Special attention has been drawn to feed quality and the preparation of feed for use. There are considerable reserves here, but they have not been adequately used to date. This year almost one-fourth of the coarse and succulent feeds tested were graded low-quality. So far more than one-half of the cattle units and one-fifth of the pig units have not been equipped with feed shops. The USSR Gosagroprom and union republic councils of ministers must resolve these questions more actively, too.

The feed protein imbalance remains an obstacle. The hydrolytic industry is called on to tackle this problem. We have more than enough waste timber products to supply it with raw materials, but the production capacities are being underutilized. It must be added that the sector's technical base has fallen far behind the modern level.

The USSR Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry in conjunction with the USSR Gosplan must reexamine, comprehensively and in the light of all factors, the question of selecting the most effective ways to increase feed protein production. The most resolute measures must also be taken first and foremost to increase the production of protein resources from renewable sources of raw materials, and to make stricter demands on scientists for scientific and technical progress in the sector.

The commissions subjected to the closest scrutiny questions of satisfying the population's effective demand more fully, finding reserves for increasing trade resources, and fundamentally improving the quality and expanding the range of consumer goods. The responsibility of trade workers for resolving those questions must be increased. At the same time, five union republics are failing to cope with the retail trade turnover plan, excluding the sale of alcoholic drinks, and the distribution of goods to the country's regions has been irregular. In recent years the trade delivery network has been cut back. Deputies noted that this has had a particular impact on the supply of goods to people living in the countryside, where 40 percent of population centers have no stores. Commission trade has still not been organized in 20 percent of cities and settlements. The proportion of public catering is not increasing in the total trade turnover volume.

The commissions have stressed that potential trade resources must be sought primarily at local level. It is necessary, for example, to expand the sale of construction materials, substandard [nekonditsionyy] goods, and usable production waste, and to organize their supply to customers. The USSR Ministry of Trade, the Tsentrosoyuz, the USSR Gossnab, and union republic councils of ministers must devote every effort to tackling these questions right away and find solutions to them.

The urgent task for next year is to substantially increase the volume of sales of paid services. It is a matter for concern that the greatest backlog in fulfilling the plans for this indicator is occurring in those union republics where the level of the population's services is still low. As the commissions discovered, there are great reserves for developing paid services in all ministries and departments but primarily in those where the provision of services is not the main activity. For example, this work has been allowed to go by the board at many enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, where consumer services comprise less than 3 percent of the total volume of paid services.

The monitoring of the work of consumer services ministries by union republic councils of ministers must be stepped up considerably. It is disquieting, deputies said in their speeches, that even under the new economic management conditions the development of enterprises' independence and initiative is being held back. For example, this year the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Consumer Services gave associations under its jurisdiction eleven times more indicators than envisaged by the new economic management conditions. At the same time, the introduction of progressive types and forms of services remains lax. The quality of and the time taken to provide services and the opening hours of enterprises still give rise to major criticism among the population.

The commissions drew the attention of republic and local organs to the extremely slow improvement of the population's transport services. The key here is often the imperfect organization of shipments and inefficient working of transport. Citizens have sent many complaints on these questions to soviet organs, which, with the increase in their powers, can do a lot. It is intolerable that, with increasing demand for passenger transport and the need to improve the quality of urban transport services, one-fourth of streetcar and trolleybus rolling stock is not being used and stands idle. It is also necessary to speed up and improve the quality of road building and repair.

The improvement of working conditions and labor protection must be a paramount duty of economic leaders in the package of social questions. Nevertheless, at many enterprises and construction sites heavy manual labor is still being eliminated slowly, the campaign against gas pollution, noise, and vibration is being conducted poorly, and safety equipment rules are breached. Ministries and departments have been set the task of more determinedly putting into operation new reserves for increasing labor productivity by creating the conditions everywhere for peopled to do fruitful and high-quality work.

The commissions noted considerable shortcomings in work to further improve public education and deemed it expedient to instruct the USSR Ministry of Education, the USSR Main Administration for Vocational and Technical Education, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, and union republic councils of ministers to take vigorous measures to accelerate the implementation of the general education and vocational school reform, implement the restructuring of higher and secondary specialized education, and improve the quality of training and educational work and students' vocational training.

During the examination of cultural building questions, it was stressed that it is necessary to urgently improve the activity of cultural and educational institutions. Many stereotyped and long-outmoded forms and methods of work with people persist here -- which leads to a decline in the number of people attending theatres, clubs, and culture complexes and centers using libraries. Even such a traditionally popular art form as the cinema is losing ground. The trend toward quantitative indicators has to a considerable extent produced a decline in the artistic standard of many movies, leading to a fall in attendances and making the movie industry unprofitable. The USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, and union republic councils of ministers must free the initiative of creative production organizations and work to increase their influence on the process of educating the new man and molding a modern way of thinking.

The attention of ministry and department leaders is drawn to the exceptionally great importance of a qualitatively new approach to finances. However, this has not really been considered by everyone, and enterprises' activity is often evaluated according to outmoded criteria. How else can one explain the fact that almost one-fourth of industrial enterprises and construction organizations are failing to cope with the plan targets for obtaining savings. A considerable number of enterprises and organizations are working at a loss. For a number of years now many ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers have failed to take determined measures to ensure the retention of their own circulating capital. Above-norm stocks of commodities and material assets not backed by bank credit continue to increase.

USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers are instructed to work persistently to improve the state of finance, to end the unprofitability of enterprises, and for that purpose to make full use of the new methods of economic management and to increase the demands on cadres for achieving good final national economic results.

The commissions' conclusions also make recommendations on other sections of the 1987 plan and budget. The recommendations stress the need to enhance the role and responsibility of soviets for resolving the whole range of restructuring tasks and fulfilling the country's socioeconomic development plans. Certain resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers provide the soviets with new potential. However, their implementation has not been launched in a businesslike way everywhere and departmental and local obstacles remain in some places. To ensure the fulfillment of plan targets it is particularly important to step up soviets' influence on higher-ranking enterprises located on their territory. Soviets must more firmly counteract certain economic leaders' reluctance or inability to take account of the population's real vital needs. Local soviet organ personnel must show far greater principle and consistency and aim to find and commission local reserves.

Comrade Deputies! The targets of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the USSR State Budget for 1987 meet the 27th CPSU Congress guidelines, are based on the indicators and norms of the 5-year plan, and are demanding but realisltic. USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers must take maximum account of the commissions' proposals and adopt the measures necessary for their implementation.

It is important today to consolidate the positive changes in the country's economy, make maximum use of the deep reserves of economic growth, and ensure even work and a high level of discipline and organization in every labor collective. The main thing is to mobilize all the available potential to give a fitting greeting to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. [applause]

RYABEV APPOINTED MACHINE BUILDING MINISTER

LD221359 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS) -- The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Lev Ryabev USSR minister of medium machine building.

Lev Ryabev was born in 1933. In 1957 he graduated from the Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute. He started his career in 1957 as an engineer; then he was deputy chief engineer, deputy director, and director of the Scientific and Research Institute of the USSR Ministry of Medium Machine Building. From 1969 until 1972 he worked as a head of a department of the Gorkiy Oblast Committee of the CPSU. From 1978 until 1984 he was head of a CPSU Central Committee department (R. Sector). [not further specified] From 1984 he was a deputy and from June 1986 the first deputy of the USSR minister of medium machine building.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has freed Yefim Slavskiy from the duties of the USSR minister of medium machine building in connection with his retirement due to his state of health.

YELTSIN ADDRESSES SUBWAY WORKERS CONFERENCE

LD221955 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Nov 86

[Text] We have all become used to thinking that the Moscow metro is the best in the world. It is indeed the pride of the capital, and is one of its sights. But as delegates at the trade union accountability and election conference of metro workers said today, the capital's underground railway has recently faced problems concerning organization, technical equipment supply, labor conditions and the service. A businesslike, frank discussion was held at the conference on the problems facing Moscow metro workers.

The capital's metro is entering a new stage in its development. The commissioning of 45 km of new lines has to be guaranteed according to the 5-year plan. Modernization of tasks and the reconstruction of 109 km of existing lines are urgent tasks. An automated system for controlling traffic has to be introduced. New capacities are being set up to repair the rolling stock and escalators. Time is dictating the need for a radical improvement in the attitude of every worker to the safety of traffic and the rigorous observance of his schedule.

Delegates at the conference called upon metro workers to achieve their set tasks and justify the hopes of Muscovites and guests to the capital.

Comrade Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom addressed the conference.

OFFICIAL DISMISSED OVER WINTER PREPARATIONS

LD211248 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] The Volgograd Gorispolkom did not manage to weather the first frosts of winter. Since the start of the cold season the radiators in the apartments of many citizens have remained cold. Yet if you were to judge by the reports and accounts, the city's communal services were significantly better prepared for winter than last year. And the chairman of the Gorispolkom, Comrade Atapov, who was invited to a session of the obkom buro, also provided himself with figures attesting to prosperity. But the members of the buro demanded with absolute strictness and principle an account of specific actions.

For serious shortcomings in preparation of the communal sector for the winter, the obkom buro gave Atapov a reprimand to be entered in his record, and it deemed it impossible for him to remain in his post.

At a session of the city council it was noted that the shortcomings in preparing the city for winter are not accidental and are repeated from one year to the next. Only a new approach to the work will make it possible to get rid of the disproportion in the development of industry and the social sphere.

In this 5-year plan Volgograders will have much to do: increase rates, improve quality in housing construction; implement a multifaceted program for social development which is planned for the celebrations of the city's 400th anniversary. To this end it is essential to activate the work of all deputies and not permit the mistakes of the past. In a word, not talk, but getting on with the job.

TASS NOTES GRAIN YIELD TOTALS 210 MILLION TONS

LD211753 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 21 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS -- Grain yield will total 210 million tons in the USSR this year, according to tentative estimates. This is almost 30 million tons up on the average annual gross output in the previous five-year plan period and exceeds by some 18 million tons the 1985 harvest.

Under the plans, the annual cereals output in the USSR should be brought to 250-255 million tons at the end of the current five-year period (1986-1990).

PAPER ASSESSES ROLE OF PERSONAL SUBSIDIARY PLOTS

PM211621 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Nov 86 p 1

[Editorial: "Land by the Home"]

[Text] Around 9.4 million hectares of land are in personal use by our country's population: Homestead plots account for more than 8.6 million hectares and orchards and truck gardens for over 760,000 hectares. There is also the land attached to dachas, the field areas allocated for a certain time for the cultivation of potatoes and vegetables, and other land. The production capital of personal subsidiary plots is close to R12 billion. It is true that they differ substantially from the plots at the disposal of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, in that they are more suited to small-scale and mainly manual labor. Indeed, the actual selection of crops grown there is not the same as in collective farming. This is evidence of a clear division of functions: Grain and industrial crops are hardly cultivated on them at all. On the other hand more than half the overall total of fruit and berries, 62-63 percent of potatoes, and approximately one-third of all vegetables are harvested from personal plots. Some 24 million head of livestock, including 13.1 million cattle, around 14 million hogs, 32.7 million sheep and goats, and hundreds of millions of hens, ducks, geese and turkeys are kept at rural homesteads. Last year they produced 4.7 million metric tons of meat, 22.2 million metric tons of milk, and 21.9 million [as published] eggs.

Homestead farming helps to improve the living standard of the country's entire population both directly and indirectly and determines many features of rural life and the socioeconomic development in general of villages, hamlets, and small towns. Working in the orchard, the truck garden, the domestic "livestock unit," or with bees requires a considerable expenditure of labor, time, knowledge, and skills. It is carried out to a considerable degree through the efforts of housewives, pensioners, and adolescents, that is, people not engaged in social production. Thus, personal subsidiary farms serve as an addition to social production. However, their role is not restricted to the purely economic area: People in the countryside are introduced to work on the land at an early age, they acquire a love for it and learn how to cultivate truck-garden and orchard crops and how to tend animals.

At one time homestead plots and arms were a noncollectivized part of the peasant economy, standing right next to the house and easing the peasants' changeover to social production. But with time their nature changed. It became clear that they were necessary as such and were of considerable national economic significance, because they had become a productive form of socialist personal ownership for a huge number of families and are now an organic component of the whole system of the agro-industrial complex.

Moreover they are now an inherent feature of whole social sections of the rural and sometimes even the urban population. The running of the personal subsidiary farms is based on the participation of kolkhoz members and workers and employees of sovkhozes and interfarm and other enterprises of the agro-industrial complex in social production. The income derived from personal subsidiary farms is used to a considerable degree to maintain and expand social production. For this reason it is important to increase their productivity.

Although the share of personal subsidiary farms in the gross output of arable farming and stockraising is not increasing but decreasing (in 1960 it was 35.6 percent, and not it is 25 percent), because social production is developing more rapidly, now as time passes they too are producing more and more. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on the development of personal subisdiary farms of kolkhoz members, workers, employees, and other citizens and on collective fruit and vegetable growing (1977), and also on additional measures to increase production of agricultural produce on citizens' personal subisdiary farms (1981) boosted interest in improving their productivity and marketability and helped to strengthen their relations with kolhozes and sovkhozes and with procurement workers.

It is true that the marketability of personal subsidiary farms is still not very high -- approximately 12 percent. A considerable amount of their produce is purchased by consumer cooperatives: half of all potoatoes, more than three-fifths of melon crops, skins, and furs. As for meat (slaughter weight), the consumer cooperatives purchased 3.45 million metric tons in the 10th 5-year period, 5.25 million metric tons in the 11th 5-year period, and in the current 5-year period it is planned to purchase up to 6.2 million metric tons. Altogether personal subsidiary farms account for half the produce procured by cooperative workers. This figure can and must be increased even more. The editorial office often receives letters from the localities with complaints that procurement workers sometimes refuse to take potatoes, vegetables, fruits, rabbits, and poultry. It is the duty of cooperative workers to change their attitude to matters in a very short space of time, develop their base, and organize specialized transport so that every kilogram of apples and every liter of milk can be purchased directly on the spot, including truck-garden produce. It is also important to organize in exchange the sale of mixed feed, fertilizer, construction materials, and so forth.

Rural inhabitants also frequently complain that there is often nowhere for them to obtain heifers, cows, bulls, young hogs, or pedigree poultry. They are not always assisted in this respect even by their own kolkhoz or sovkhoz. Yet who else if not the collectivized farms should provide all the homesteads with pedigree livestock and poultry" What is more, they should accurately plan the necessary livestock numbers for them and, by intensifying production as much as possible, they should grow the right volumes of feed crops and lay out cultivated pastureland on the right scale, so as to fully satisfy the needs not only of the collectivized livestock but also of the personal subsidiary farms and to increase their productivity and buy more of their produce to fulfill state plans and satisfy the needs of the local population. The experience of many rayons in Omsk, Gorkiy, and other oblasts, for example, attests to the effectiveness of such an approach.

There are several instructive examples in the country of good, purposeful work by rayon and rural soviets, and also kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises in providing personal subsidiary farms with everything necessary for their normal development and the improvement of their yields. Thus, in Gorkiy Oblast almost 540,000 families have domestic "livestock units," and in the first 6 months of this year alone they sold more than 18,000 heifers, around 200,000 young hogs, and almost 1.5 million chickens, ducks, and geese. [paragraph continues]

Talk about returns? The inhabitants of Bolsherybushkinskiy rural soviet -- per homestead farm -- last year sold 237 kg of meat (live weight) and 2,036 kg of milk per cow per farm! Such are the reserves.

Local soviet and economic organs and the rayon agro-industrial associations must show far more concern in ensuring that life and work go on normally on every homestead farm, that their land does not lie "fallow" beneath weeds and nettles, and that the most productive strains and breeds are grown. There are several examples in the country of skillful solutions to this problem. Thus, in Lithuania there are 44 seed-growing farms in operation and their produce is sold by a wide network of stores and stalls which always have a big choice of zoned strains of vegetables and flowers. And because the general standard of arable farming on personal subsidiary farms there is quite high, the harvests, the purchases, and the sale of truck-garden produce in the republic'§ markets are also increasing. However, this is still by no means the situation everywhere. Many seed stores, expecially in rayon cities, have an extremely meager selection. Sometimes there is even nowhere to buy high-quality potatoes. The task of institutions, experimental stations, seed-growing farms, and fruit nurseries is to considerably improve the supply of seeds to the population, increase their sowing qualities, and overcome the shortage of fruit crop and berry bush seedlings.

It is the duty of state trade and consumer cooperatives to improve the provision of truck-garden implements to personal subsidiary farms, and the duty of the industrial enterprises which produce them to improve the quality especially of tools such as scythes, spades, rakes, and hoes and to organize the production and sale of light, cheap motorized units [motobloki] with complete sets of working implements for them. There must also be a greater range on sale than before of mineral fertilizers, lime, whitewashing materials, sheeting for hothouses and complete hothouse complexes, pumps, and watering devices, and also standard equipment for maintaining and feeding livestock, poultry, and rabbits, construction materials, and refrigerators designed to store large amounts of perishable produce. All these measures will directly and actively help to fulfill the country's Food Program.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 19-22 NOV REPORTED

LD230631 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 19-22 November. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

19 November
The Namagan Oblast, in Uzbekistan, is selling above-plan cotton to the state: It has delivered so far 430,000 metric tons of high-quality cotton to procurement centers. (0230)
20 November
No fileworthy reports monitored
21 November
No fileworthy reports monitored
22 November

The Spasskoye mixed feed works has reached design capacity, thereby reducing Maritime Kray's dependence on concentrates deliveries from other parts of the country. Meanwhile, the largest mixed feed enterprise in the Far East is nearing completion in Artem; it will produce 1,000 metric tons of output daily. (0100)

PRAVDA NOTES COSMOS SATELLITE FLIGHT PARAMETERS

PM251055 MOSCOW PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS report under the general heading: "Satellites Launched"]

[Text] The following artificial satellites were launched in the Soviet Union on 21 November 1986: Cosmos-1794, Cosmos-1795, Cosmos-1796, Cosmos-1797, Cosmos-1798, Cosmos-1799, Cosmos-1800, and Cosmos-1801. All eight satellites were placed in orbit by a single rocket.

The satellites are carrying scientific apparatus for the ongoing exploration of space.

All eight satellites are following paths close to the calculated orbits with the following original parameters:

duration of revolution -- 115 minutes;
maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee) -- 1,504 km; (perigee) -- 1,436 km;
inclination of orbit -- 74 degrees.

As well as scientific apparatus the satellites are carrying radio systems for the precise measurement of orbital elements and radiotelemetry systems for transmitting to earth data on the functioning of instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellites is functioning normally. The computer coordination center is processing the incoming information.

TASS NOTES LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1802 25 NOV

LD250850 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS -- The Soviet Union today launched another satellite in the Cosmos series.

Cosmos-1802 carries scientific equipment to continue space exploration.

It was inserted into an orbiting path with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution - 105 minutes,
Maximum distance from earth - 1,038 kilometers,
Minimum distance - 985 kilometers,
Inclination - 83 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

NEW SPACE STATION TECHNOLOGY INTRODUCED

OW221434 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From "Science and Technology" program]

[Excerpts] This year, Soviet academicians, experts, and cosmonauts have conducted complicated and diversified experiments in orbits around the earth.

In particular, Cosmonauts Solovyev and Kizim conducted various experiments in the new orbit station, the Mir. The Mir station is equipped with 6 docking units and various modules for research and production will be attached to the station in the future. The total weight of all these modules reaches 20 metric tons, a remarkable weight when viewed relative to present standards. With new technology, the Mir station has solved various problems of maintaining life, labor, and rest for the crew members. Computer are used for all the systems on the station. Problems concerning the guarantee of ideal conditions for docking a cargo ship or manned spaceship to the station have also been solved. For this purpose, the Mir is equipped with improved approach and docking systems that have been tested in the flight of a new spaceship, Solyut TM. The Solyut TM was launched on an automated flight without any crew member aboard. Regarding this flight, (Yuriy Sominayev), leader of the design in the production of manned spaceships for an international program, stated as follows:

[Begin (Sominayev) recording in Russian, fading into Japanese translation] In this flight, Solyut TM automatically circled the station and docked at the pre-designated unit. This test is of great importance to the massive complex. The new spaceship also has many other advantages. It is much larger loading capacity compared to the old spaceships, and it will replace Solyut T as cosmonauts will fly in Solyut TM in the future. The ship's size has not changed, but many of its systems are different in structure. The spaceships of the old series were built for operation with the old Solyut-type stations. [passage omitted]

According to our plans, the Mir station will be turned into a complicated complex with several branches as research modules will be docked with the station. However, the modules will not be arranged on both sides in a symmetrical way. For such an object to revolve, it requires much more fuel. To avoid this, a new (?cooling) system, that is [words indistinct] system, has been developed in place of the (?iglar) system. It does not matter how the station is aligned in space because the spaceship will approach the station, revolve around the docking unit, and then dock with the station. In place of the ("dal") communication system that has been used before, the new spaceship will be equipped with [words indistinct] system. With this new system for example, crew members of the spaceship will be able to communicate with the ground first through the Mir station and then through the relay satellite orbiting above the equator. In this way, the range of communications will be greatly expanded.

The spaceship will also have a new parachuting system. Thanks to new, much lighter and stronger materials, the weight of the spaceship can be considerably reduced. The engine equipment for the emergency rescue system has also become much lighter. Through these improvements, it has become possible to increase the weight of the cargo in orbiting.

PACIFIC BOOSTER ROCKET TESTS COMPLETED

LD251157 Moscow TASS in English 1146 GMT 25 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS -- As the planned booster rocket launches have been completed, TASS is authorized to declare that the Pacific areas restricted by a circle with a radius of 30 nautical miles, its center being in latitude 22 degrees 35 minutes north longitude 174 degrees 10 minutes east, and a circle with a radius of 25 nautical miles, its center being in latitude 19 degrees 10 minutes north and longitude 174 degrees 45 minutes east, which were mentioned in the TASS announcement of November 21, 1986, are open to shipping and aircraft traffic from November 26, 1986.